

THE MONTH

337

VOL. CLXXVIII

SEPT.—OCT., 1942

No. 929

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

The Eastern Front

FURIOUS and embittered warfare is being waged on the eastern front where the Russians display an astonishing tenacity of resistance. First Sevastopol and then Stalingrad. The two names will live in history with that of Verdun. This summer the German military plan appears to have been a double one. First of all, they hoped, after breaking through the Russian defences, to secure the major oil fields or, at the very least, to deny their use to the Soviet forces. The second intention was to seize Stalingrad and advance to the Volga, thus cutting the main communications between Russia's central and southern armies. They then proposed to turn North-East, basing this new movement upon captured Stalingrad and Voronezh, and to roll up the flank of the central Soviet armies. The Germans have not yet succeeded and, in any case, they are well behind their schedule. There is a very good chance that this 1942 summer offensive will badly miscarry. If it does, morale will slump miserably within Germany, and the German people will begin to see the grim spectre of defeat. Germany intended—and no doubt still hopes—to overcome or paralyse Russian opposition before the onset of winter.

Some Mistaken Notions

THE world's attention is focussed upon this eastern scene of war. This is natural enough and there is every reason for saluting the wise Russian generalship and the remarkable fighting qualities of the Russian people. But certain ideas are gaining ground which require correction. It is argued that the Russians are putting up so stout a resistance because they are enthusiastic about the Bolshevik social and economic system. They are the first people, we are reminded, to stand up to the Nazi war machine on land: this must be due—continues the argument—to their fervid attachment to the Marx-Lenin-Stalin way of life.

VOL. CLXXVIII SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER, 1942.

Y

But where's the evidence for it? To begin with, the Russians had half a continent to play with, and defence in depth was possible in Russia in a manner that was inconceivable in France. Then, it is scarcely flattering to the Russians to learn that Bolshevism has lent them apparently a valour which, taken merely as Russians, they did not possess. They fought gallantly against Napoleon in 1812 and against the Germans and Austrians in the last war. What evidence there is goes to show that this is for them a national war—a struggle of Slav against Teuton, of Russian against the German. Men and women will defend hearth and home against the foreigner however cordially they detest their own political and social system. Our British Communist who flaunts an imported doctrine in this tolerant country, is no good judge of national feeling, in Russia or here. This phenomenon of national unitedness despite profound and wide-spread distrust of the home government and its internal policy is no new one in Russian experience. The Czar, Ivan the Terrible, was tyrant enough. His rule, according to the Russian historian Kliutchevsky, "revolted the moral sense of Christian society."

Yet this society suffered in silence. . . . The people were oppressed and murmured. But there was no shadow of an open protest. . . . It seemed that a population of many millions had forgotten that the measure of patience can be exhausted. . . . It was as if a higher interest dominated society, its inner conflicts and dissensions, not permitting a final rift, forcing it against its will to act in unison. This higher interest was the defence of the State against foreign enemies.

A similar tale might be told of the invasion of 1812. The rumour was spread that Napoleon intended to liberate the Russian peasants from serfdom. The liberal-minded Russians were all against serfdom and the peasants frequently rose in revolt against their masters. But no one in Russia wanted to accept liberation from the invader's hand. There was, so to speak, a counter-movement. Certain units of the peasant militia that has been mobilized to resist the French started a rebellion against their officers. Yet the slogan of these mutineers was: "Let us march and defeat the enemy, and then we shall beseech the Czar to free us in reward for victory." The quality of the Russian resistance is not necessarily an indication of any whole-hearted acceptance of the Bolshevik regime.

Further Evidence

IT is notoriously difficult to appraise conditions in Russia, not least because the Soviet authorities are not anxious even now to admit foreign observers from the other United Nations. One possible reply to the Communist demand for a second front would be the suggestion that British and American reinforcements should be sent to Russia. Would such an offer be accepted? A recent number of *Commonweal* collects evidence from *Novoye Russkoye Slovo*, a Russian publication from New York, and also from a New York Polish organ, *Robotnik Polski*. The evidence collected in the *Commonweal* article by Miss Helen Iswolsky, a daughter of the Russian Foreign Minister from 1905 to 1909, confirms the thesis that the Russian people regard this war as national and not ideological. She quotes the testimony of a captain in the Red army who "never mentioned the Soviet Union or the U.S.S.R., but always said 'Russia,' 'We Russians,' 'the Russian Army,' etc." She records an interview with a mechanic serving on an American transport that had been shipping armaments to Russia. This seaman declared that he was impressed by the "unanimous patriotic feeling" of the Russians. Never had we witnessed, he said, such a tension of all national energies :

What is most remarkable is that the only common ideology is not a "class" or "party" ideology, but the slogan "for Russia, for the Fatherland" . . . More correctly speaking, even Party propaganda sets forth that very slogan. And when I spoke to people, I often heard them say, "For Holy Russia, for Mother-Russia."

German reports from occupied Russian territory show their disappointment with the non-Bolshevik elements among the population. Their complaint is that these elements will not co-operate with them. This remark, notes Miss Iswolsky, "proves two factors of considerable interest : first, that anti-Soviet, that is anti-Communist elements, *exist* in occupied territory ; second, that they do not co-operate with the Germans. Thus Hitler's initial intention of making Russians fight against Russians in an anti-Communist 'crusade' has met with complete failure." However dissatisfied certain elements of the Russian population may have been with Stalin's régime, and however dissatisfied they may still be, the hatred of the aggressor is at the present moment stronger

than any tendency towards political unrest. Russia first of all, and it is often "Holy Russia," "Mother Russia." Speaking in London on September 24th, Sir Paul Dukes asserted that the Russian war spirit is an essentially national spirit, and added his opinion that, by the time the war is over, Bolshevism will be forgotten and the Comintern abolished.

This Second Front

IT is taken for granted that, someday and somehow, a second land front will be established on the Continent. Germany will not finally be overcome until her land armies are decisively defeated. Most Englishmen are content to leave the decision of the When? and Where? and How? to the competent authorities who will, in any case, have the responsibility of making it. Americans, accustomed to quicker returns than ourselves, are possibly more impatient of inaction. And there exists a well-subsidised and noisy propaganda that clamours for a "Second Front Now": this is Communist-inspired. Its argument is that we ought to strike now in the West while Soviet resistance is still vigorous. Its purpose is professedly to relieve German pressure on the eastern front. Yet it is highly doubtful whether it would have this effect at once. The Germans have something like three million troops in the West, a large proportion of them in France and the Low Countries. They could hold up a second front for a considerable time without drawing one single soldier from Russia. Britain's retirement from the Continent after the collapse of France meant and means that she could not again enter on continental soil except under very favourable conditions—which are being created but are not yet, presumably, fully realised. Britain has made three attempts to establish a land front on the Continent during this war. There was a second front in France, from September, 1939, until June, 1940. Soviet Russia made no move, and that second front succumbed. A previous attempt was made to start such a front in Norway, and later a further front was improvised in the Balkans and Crete. Right, left and centre—these three attempts have been made. A fourth experiment must have such promising chances of success that it will not jeopardize, as failure would seriously jeopardize, Britain's position. The "second front"

will come when the German armies have been further weakened and disheartened, and when sufficient reserves of shipping and material are accumulated. We must not forget the massive assistance that Britain and the United States have been affording to Russia. Each convoy to Murmansk involves a determined sea and air battle. These major strategical questions are best resolved in the secrecy of War Councils, and not in our more popular papers or in notices scribbled in chalk on our city walls.

A Catholic Manifesto from the United States

SOME time ago, a lengthy manifesto was prepared and signed by a large number of European Catholics who happened to be in the United States. Among the signatories were Jacques Maritain, Yves Simon, Henri de Kérillis, Pères Couturier, Delos and Ducattillon, O.P. (France), Mm. Van Zeeland and Van Cauwelaert (Belgium), Sigrid Undset (Norway), Dietrich von Hildebrand, Waldemar Gurian and Guido Zernatto (Germany and Austria), Professor Oscar Halecki (Poland), Sir Philip Gibbs, Alfred Noyes and F. J. Sheed (Great Britain), and many others. The manifesto is long and thoughtful. It opens with an explicit rejection of all totalitarianism, whether in its "Marxist historical materialism" form or in that of "Nazi biological materialism." The issue of the war is not "democracy," understood as some political system or some particular political forms. Neither is it "capitalism" and if "plutocratic" interests are defending themselves under cover of this war, "this encounter—accidental in regard to what is really at stake and obviously made transitory by the ruins and transformations which the war itself produces—binds neither our judgment nor our action nor our will for social reform." The Nazi revolution in arms which is seeking to dominate the world, aims at the setting up of "a radically anti-Christian order on this earth." "It attacks Christianity by denying and blaspheming Mercy and Charity and by sacrificing everything to the pride of power. . . . Persecution could be avoided only at the price of making the faith impotent and sterile among Christians, of the corruption of the Catholic world from within, of that which the Cardinal Patriarch of Lisbon has called a *deChristianization of the Church herself*. Even in those cases where they are

clothed in less radical forms and where they are introduced under some protective veil, totalitarian régimes inevitably move towards the realization of this pattern, more deadly to religion than open persecution. There is no more pernicious illusion than to imagine that one can christianize totalitarianism." The actual issue at stake—this is the conclusion—"is the very possibility of living as men, the very existence or destruction of the elementary bases of the natural law and civilized life, the maintenance or the destruction of the essential principles of Christianity in the life of peoples, and the very possibility of working towards a Christian civilization." Finally, after laying down general principles for reconstruction, the manifesto declares that men must go back "to the very bedrock of our thought . . . we must once more in all realms quarry out the principles on which rests the Christian conception of the world, in its turn the basis for our action—that is the lesson taught us by the progress of totalitarianism."

The Manifesto on Russia

THIS manifesto rejects Bolshevism together with Nazism. Both are totalitarian, both are thoroughly opposed to Christian standards, both are subversive of the bases of natural law and civilized life. But it includes some paragraphs on the attitude of the signatories to the Russian-German conflict which are distinctly helpful. They run as follows :

1. In the death struggle in which the free peoples of the world are engaged, it is their great good fortune, with which it would be senseless to refuse to co-operate, that Russia, rather than remaining neutral or joining with Germany, should have brought to play its military power, the measureless effort and the patriotic bravery of its people against the common enemy, Nazism. Russia was attacked by the Nazis. The Russian people are defending their homes. By helping them in their struggle, the United Nations do nothing which does not conform to the rules of the law of nations.

2. Given the present situation of opposing forces, a victory of Hitler's would immediately hold for the entire world consequences of a breadth and gravity to which even a sweeping Russian victory would not lead. Such a Russian victory would leave the democratic powers their freedom of action, would leave free to act the Christian energies which still work therein and have therein every opportunity to widen their range. The Western world would retain the possibility of

opposing the development within its own body of the Communist ferment by any fitting action—above all by depriving Communism of its pretexts. It is important only, while helping the Russian people, that one be thoroughly resolved to guard against Communism—which, of course, presents difficult problems. Yet thus to guard oneself is not at all impossible.

3. Finally, the all important historical fact is that in moving over to the democratic camp, the Russian people is in the process of re-entering the Western community, and that in itself enlarges the possibilities of civilization's victory. The leaven of Christian forces ever exists in this people, despite the havoc wrought by atheist propaganda in Russia and despite persecution. An action of generosity and justice towards the Russian people on the part of Christians will help them in the work of transformation which may take place within them, and which, without leading that people back into the social patterns of the past, can deliver them from the spiritual and political evils from which they now suffer.

Christian Affirmations

THIS manifesto finds plenty parallels in Britain from Press and public platform. Viewing the national picture merely from one side, there is evidence of a reviving Christian outlook in many sections of the populace. And public men have emphasized the essentially Christian issues involved in the war. In a broadcast to the people of the United States on September 20th, Lord Halifax spoke of his impressions after a visit to England.

Although we see the war as one of liberation for the enslaved peoples, we also see it as a struggle to keep open the road from a Christian past to a more Christian future. We know that, stripped of the accidents which have brought this or that nation into war, the real issue for us is whether Christianity and all that it means is to survive.

Lord Halifax anticipated the objection that, in the present condition of Britain, this is an over-statement. He did not reply to it directly but insisted, firstly, that nearly everything of value in our lives is of Christian origin, and secondly that the British people had never turned their backs upon this Christian inheritance, whatever may have been their lethargy and neglect.

Through all the sorrows of this war—this was his conclusion—we are groping our way to a new understanding of these old (i.e., Christian) truths. The recovery of them is giving us a new confidence in ourselves and in our future. It is adding fire to our purpose and strength to our arms. If these things, as most of us dimly feel, are true at all, they matter more than

anything else ; and those who believe them must go all out and fight for them.

A day or two later, Sir Samuel Hoare, back from the British Embassy at Madrid, stressed the same necessity of holding to the Christian heritage : what remained of it was being challenged in this war. And he traced back this Christian tradition in Europe as well as Britain.

(With the Reformation) Europe lost a unifying influence, an influence that may often have been abused, mishandled and ignored, but none the less existed as a potential force of great good.

There existed throughout Europe, he declared, a consciousness that some new unity of the kind must be discovered, with a spiritual force to inspire and direct it. He welcomed certain indications of what he called a new crusade, among them the growing co-operation between Catholics, Anglicans and Free Churchmen. These two addresses are significant as they were encouraging. But they present only one side of the national picture : there is a reverse and darker side which will be considered later.

The Albert Hall Meeting

ON Saturday, September 26th, the Industrial Christian Fellowship staged the first of its series of mass meetings which, we understand, are to be addressed by the two Anglican archbishops. On this occasion they were joined on the platform by the Bishop of Bristol, Chairman of the I.C.F., Miss Knight-Bruce, and the Lord Privy Seal, Sir Stafford Cripps. The meeting was admirably arranged and stage-managed ; the speeches were interesting and varied ; the large audience was highly appreciative. The Archbishop of Canterbury outlined what he termed the special task in the future of the Church of England. Dr. Garbett, Archbishop of York, confined himself to the practical problem of housing, in both town and country. Miss Knight-Bruce spoke of education while Sir Stafford Cripps challenged Christianity though himself coming down heavily upon the side of the challenged. Dr. Temple was faced with the inevitable dilemma of the Christian social reformer. Stick to the enunciation of general Christian principles, and you are safe but you are accused of not getting down to the real issue ! Go further than your general principles

and commit yourself to a definite solution of a concrete problem, and you have divided your fellow Christians! On certain points Dr. Temple elected to remain on the dilemma's second horn. He suggested, for example—rightly or wrongly, that is a further question—that the banks should be limited in lending power to the amount deposited by their clients, and that the issue of new credit should be the function of a public authority. As we write, that conclusion is already challenged in newspaper correspondence. A Catholic listening to Dr. Temple admired his address and echoed his claim that Christian authorities have both the right and duty to declare those principles which should govern the ordering of society. At the same time, he considered that tribute ought to have been paid to the Catholic Church for the manner in which, throughout the Middle Ages and, in Catholic countries since, she has continually emphasized those social and political principles required for the right ordering of a country's life. Mention should have been made of the grand lead of the Papal encyclicals on social questions, from Leo XIII up to the present day. The term "Church" must, of course, be ambiguous, as used by Catholics and non-Catholics. Sir Stafford Cripps began with a note on two different conceptions of a Christian church. The first regards it as a channel of personal salvation, with the major emphasis transferred to the after-life; the second as an agent for the rule of God on earth, that is as the pioneer of what he called "social salvation." The former conception he rejected—at least in itself—as too individual and unworldly: "it is this two-worldly conception of religion which discourages the daily practice of our faith in the social and economic spheres of our lives." The latter notion "makes our daily actions the vital means of interpreting the Christian ethic in our human society." The antithesis of Sir Stafford is, to some extent, an unreal one. A Christian must aim at personal salvation. His religion is, in the first place, a personal relation, but it is a personal relation which finds its true home in a corporate society, the Church, that Christ established. He is, and must inevitably be, unworldly and other-worldly in vision and ideal but he lives in the world, in a human society, with relations towards his fellow-men, relations in justice and Christian charity. The reason for the lack of social justice in many of our national institutions is not the undue

concern of too many Englishmen with their personal salvation and the other world. It has been the prevalent materialism. They neglected their social obligations to other men because they had no vivid concern about their position before God. Our nineteenth-century social system is so largely unChristian because it was not made by Christians or under Christian influence. We need "courageous Christians in public life," the Lord Privy Seal rightly warned us. But they must be Christian, profoundly Christian in their personal lives, as well as in their vision of social and economic reforms.

The Future of Education

AT this same meeting Miss Knight-Bruce put the problem of Christian education. And here we approach the reverse side of this picture of Britain. The Nazis, the speaker reminded her audience, have integrated their education.

It is significant that the German Teacher's Manual, recognising the necessity for religion if education is to be truly vital, unifies all school activity for the purpose of their all-embracing creed. It is a religion terrible, bloodthirsty, brutal, but taught with complete success, believed in with enthusiasm and lived out in detail.

Meanwhile we, in Christian England, debate whether our glorious Faith shall, or shall not, be taught our children; whether our nation shall, or shall not, be composed of citizens trained in the teaching of Him Whose service is perfect freedom, and in the concept of man based upon His spiritual greatness, into line with which unsurpassed concept of man's true nature all material things must be brought.

The question is—not whether religion shall be taught in our schools as one subject among many (to which the many bears no relation); but whether the Christian faith handed down to us is to be the integrating principle of all cultural and specialist activities, giving to all, while admitting their autonomy in their proper sphere, a purpose worthy of man's spiritual and material nature.

That puts the problem very fairly. This has been the *ideal* of Catholic education, whatever may have been the failure to realise it in practice—that integration of all studies and every aspect of human life into one Catholic whole. From time to time during the war the *Times* and other organs have brought to public notice the appalling ignorance of even the most elementary Christian facts among large numbers of the British people. In the words of Lord Halifax, the issue of the war is whether Christianity can survive; and

great numbers of those who are fighting this struggle—whatever their legacy of Christian behaviour and personal reaction—have little idea what Christianity is about. And yet, to judge merely from a national standpoint, you must have a strong enthusiasm to set over against the fanaticism of the Nazis. It can only be a Christian enthusiasm, and it flickers all too faintly in this country to-day. The so-called “religious teaching” in our State elementary schools stands self-condemned by the religious ignorance and apathy of the vast majority who have passed through them. The “undenominational Christianity” to which they were introduced was too vague and artificial to lay hold of their minds. And yet, despite this evident deterioration, the Free Church Federal Council (*Times*, September 30th) has again declared that there is no alteration in its attitude towards education. This advocates a completely national system of education, from which all denominational schools would eventually be eliminated. It objects to religious tests for teachers and is equally opposed to any extension of the present financial aid from public funds to denominational schools unless the full control of these schools passes to the local educational authorities. We are back at that Liberal-Nonconformist position of the early century which has proved disastrous to the Christian formation of the English people.

Signs of the Times

THE Catholic objections to this Free Church attitude are so familiar that they do not require re-statement. We take exception to the glib phrase “public funds” as though this were some merciful bounty, provided by a generous State, instead of consisting of the rates and taxes of Catholics and Anglicans as well as Free Churchmen. And out of those public funds to which all citizens contribute in their degree the denominational schools have enjoyed far less than their reasonable share. The “non-provided” schools have been deliberately penalised: it has been made deliberately harder for parents to secure a full Christian formation for their boys and girls. It is argued that certain “non-provided” schools have shown themselves less well equipped and less efficient than their State counterparts. Whether this charge be true or not, the excuse is a valid one and the remedy obvious. Treat these “non-provided”

schools with greater fairness and you will find them in no way behind their secular rivals. The clause in the T.U.C. educational scheme that was rushed through the General Meeting at Blackpool was to the same effect as the resolution of the Free Church Federal Council. It pressed for a national school system with the elimination, speedy or gradual, of the denominational schools. Religious teaching would, in practice, be driven from the schools completely though there might be room here for some slight compromise. As we have noted, this is the reverse side of the picture, and it is a black and threatening one. This war is for freedom and yet, if these various interests could have their way, there would be no freedom of Christian education. Our struggle is against the totalitarian evil, and still certain elements within this country are so in love with method and uniformity and State-regimentation that they would foist upon us that very evil which we are combating. Leaving aside the tendentious expression "anti-Fascist," we are waging this war against Germany, and against National-Socialism. We are resisting a people that has developed its resources for total warfare in a radical manner. State-control to the utmost—that is the German method—quite irrespective of higher and spiritual values and regardless of the wishes of group or person. And when this State-control is vested in the hands of one political party, as in Germany is the case, then you have the fully totalitarian State, with its entire subordination of individual and family, sectional, cultural, and religious interests to the summons to national unity and uniformity. Now there may be no grave danger of this fully totalitarian State in Britain. Many of its features, however, have had to be imitated for purposes of war, and there are strong influences at work to keep this imitation going in time of peace. It is certain that there will be a more developed State-supervision after the war. That is inevitable and, in so far as it subserves the common good, it may be welcomed. But the ideal is not State-control. It is that individual and private interests should be made to serve, and take second place to, the public welfare and common good. State-control where it is necessary to achieve this, but most certainly not as a substitute for personal freedom, for family responsibility, for the liberty of association, social, functional or professional, or to remove the genuine rights—religious or political—of Britain's citizens.

The Norwegian Front

THERE is a continual flow of news from Europe which reflects Christian resistance to the Nazi occupation. Once again, Norway figures prominently in this news. Late in August it was reported that the Nazis and the Norwegian Quisling party were very anxious to let this Church struggle relax. The report is not borne out by the numerous arrests of Lutheran pastors, several of whom have been expelled from their parishes and banished to other districts of Norway. According to *Svenska Dagbladet* (August 25th), 96 per cent. of the clergymen in the diocese of Nidaros and all in the diocese of North Troendelag have resigned. The dean of the Snaasa district, arrested in April, has been exiled to Trondheim where he has to report every day to the German Security Police. The dean of Levanger district was arrested in May and then imprisoned in Trondheim: on his release from prison he was fined 600 kroner for his "anti-Nazi and anti-German attitude." A further report from Stockholm states that the Norwegian clergy refuse to use their official stamp for the issue of so-called "Aryan certificates" (i.e. certificates guaranteeing non-Jewish descent). The German authorities will not accept these certificates unless they bear an official stamp and they have threatened dire penalties against the Lutheran clergy unless they conform. The difficulties of educational works is revealed in another Swedish paper.

It will be very difficult to continue work at Oslo University and the High Schools elsewhere in the country. Eight professors and eight lecturers have been dismissed from Oslo University alone. The "Congregational" Faculty of the University (for Conservative theology) is still functioning but, like the University theological faculty, has very few students. The number of students in all faculties is catastrophically reduced.

The *Social Demokraten* late in August contained an account of a visit paid by Quisling to his home village. It ran as follows:

Last week, Quisling visited his home district, Fyresdal, in the county of Telemark. Eye-witnesses relate that he was accompanied by five cars full of policemen when he called at the vicarage. The minister, Otto Irgens, was abused for several hours by Quisling, who described the Norwegian clergy as a "criminal gang." Quisling said that Irgens would have been shot but for the fact that Fyresdal was Quisling's home

where his family had lived for 400 years. Quisling finally declared that Irgens was dismissed and he ordered the policemen to search the vicarage, confiscating everything, including this summer's jam and the money which Irgens had in his pocket-book.

In Bergen the wife of Zwiilmeyer, the recently appointed Quisling bishop, has been the centre of an amusing incident which has been widely reported. The *Norsk Tidend*, London's Norwegian newspaper, writes of it as below :

The inhabitants never call her anything but *Die Zwiilmeyer*. The other day she met an acquaintance, a lady who omitted to salute her. *Die Zwiilmeyer* complained to the police and the lady was fined 100 kroner. A few days afterwards *Die Zwiilmeyer* found herself in a tramcar together with this same lady who got up immediately and made a deep curtsey to *Die Zwiilmeyer*. Then she asked all the passengers to witness that she had greeted the bishop's wife. They all declared their willingness to do so, and they too got up and bowed profoundly.

Not long ago a special manifesto was issued by the Lutheran Church in Norway and read in all Norwegian churches. Its concluding paragraph would be read with great profit by those who, from unfortunate presuppositions or from actual dislike of religion, are opposing a full Christian formation in this country. Here they are :

Looking back over these two years we can see with awe and astonishment the great number of blessings which the Lord has poured out upon our Church and our people. In truth He has opened a door for us : never before in our generation have so many of our people sought God's House. Our consciences are open to truth. Every observant preacher rejoices to see God's Word received with renewed interest. From all quarters of our country we hear of great awakenings, quiet, strong and deeply impressive awakenings. God has visited our people with grace. Let us thank God and pray that He may graciously further His purpose into a nation-wide revival so that our people may come through the ordeal of fire renewed and purified. Even those sections of our people who have previously stood apart from the Church and Christendom are now beginning to discover the Church ; they respect it and are beginning to look towards it. Here also we see God's work, and give thanks for the favour that has befallen us.

France in Autumn 1942

IT is more than two years since France collapsed, and since that day many and varied have been the moods of France. Economically, the situation is stern. One-third of

the population has sufficient to eat, and the black market flourishes as open and unashamed as anywhere in the world : a second third lives well under the proper level of nourishment, the remaining third is starving. From occupied France comes news that people are continually fainting in the streets from want of food. Churches keep a Red Cross attendant on duty in the sacristy to treat cases of fainting during Mass. In occupied France this increases the anti-German feeling ; in the unoccupied districts it leads to apathy and to greater distrust of the Vichy administration. Only Pétain stands out as respected and revered. Laval—well, he is better, they would say, than Doriot or Déat or the other mean tricksters the Nazis have at their beck and call. The position of the Vichy Government is more difficult than ever. They still have the French fleet and the North African possessions where the Germans are highly suspicious of any attempted developments. This suggests that the stories of German infiltration into French North Africa were somewhat exaggerated. A diplomat, recently returned from Africa, declared that he had seen more Germans in the Grand Hotel at Madrid than in the whole of French North Africa. What the Germans want at once is the French merchant fleet. The Axis shipping situation in the Mediterranean is precarious. A considerable percentage of the Italian merchant vessels has been sunk or disabled ; and supplies are now being run to Rommel in small and slow craft. Incidentally, the Italians are alarmed at this naval position. Their fleet has suffered severe losses ; that of the French is intact. Italian merchant ships have been sorely reduced in number and efficiency. The Italians are starting to look far ahead and to envisage a French naval attack one day upon an Italy, unprotected from the sea. The Germans also want skilled French labour for war-production in Germany. Laval has identified himself with this demand and will fall eventually because of it. But despite economic pressure, French workmen are not volunteering in the numbers that the Germans require and insist upon. Meanwhile, the Nazi attempts to remove Jews, adults and children, from France has aroused profound popular feeling. Catholic bishops have vigorously protested and, in certain cases, have taken such children under their personal protection. The Madagascar incident has passed off with nothing more than a dignified protest from Pétain and symbolic resistance on the island. The

French people has again been warned from this country that the hour of a second front is drawing nearer. At times our press speaks foolishly about the French. France has its Quislings, its individuals and sections that hope to reap advantages from collaboration with the Nazis. But remember that France succumbed to evils that were strong and widespread in our own country too. France fell. We escaped to rally faith and courage, to throw aside selfishness and lethargy. The same disintegrating influences were at work on both sides of the Channel. And remember also that, if we have at our side the forces of *La France Combattante*, we have the sympathy of another France, *La France Souffrante*.

And Spain

THE situation in Spain slowly improves—at least economically. Politically there is still serious tension, but no one wishes for the horrors of renewed civil strife. Señor Suñer has gone from the Foreign Office and the Falange. He was the pro-Nazi personality and his dismissal must be regarded as an indication of greater Spanish liberty *vis à vis* the Axis. With the main German offensive so far to the East, Spain can breathe more easily. It is little likely now that the Germans will have men and leisure to march through the Peninsula. In Spain criticism of the Falange is growing. It has been discussed and censured in pastorals of bishops: and the more conservative and traditionalist sections are envisaging a restored monarchy, in the person of Don Juan. Professor Alison Peers, a recognized authority on Spanish questions, wrote somewhat pessimistically in the *Catholic Herald* (September 11th) of Spain's future. But though he points to certain ugly features in Spain's social situation, Professor Alison Peers seems to do less than justice to General Franco's success in keeping Spain out of effective collaboration with Germany and in maintaining at least a reasonable balance between the various Spanish groups.

Spain presents some contradictions. Its Press has nothing good to say of us, but its Government takes no action against us. It is a Catholic land that appears to tolerate or even to sympathise with Nazism. This sympathy was never deep and it is wearing remarkably thin. But our position in Spain would be helped were we able to make more explicit references to the post-war world we hope to build.

THE WATCHER OVER THE WORLD

MANY letters I receive, and the post-bags of my friends, tell a curious tale these days—a tale of some people desponding or rebelling because of the evil and violence abroad in the world. Most of the “faith being shaken” is of the kind which has not been well instructed, which in piping times of peace didn’t *read up* the facts, and which to-day is oddly blind to our immunities, mitigations, and perhaps unmerited deliverances.

It is all so familiar: one heard the same irritation and gloom in 1917-8, random blaming of some politician or general, and, as an after-thought, a vague impulsive crack at “the churches.” Illness of mind, however, calls for patient recital of facts. If there be a cure, it is on those lines. The war caught them mentally disarmed, as it caught the democracies grotesquely unprepared: that is all.

There was the correspondent with the *simplist* impression that “God never MADE war,” therefore He cannot be interested in it nor in men at war. The streets are dotted with honest souls who evolve these revelations out of their own heads, and constitute themselves a one-man church, a one-man nation. Another was content with his private discovery that in war, God particularly intervenes and speaks—this time to punish indiscriminately and equally all peoples, victims or aggressors. A third took a Nazi-British line, that the enemy’s sin was to believe they are the chosen race, whereas of course *we* are. A fourth even contrived a chart to show that Prussia’s occupation of non-Catholic Norway, Denmark, Holland, the Ukraine, Jugoslavia and Greece was a punishment on “Roman Catholic Europe,” while a coming obliteration of Protestant Prussia by Communist Russia’s bombers would be a punishment of the aforesaid punisher. Others, far less certifiable and more sympathetic, asked why we should pray if God knew our desires? Or whether prayer was not an attempt to “force” the Divine Will? Or whether our neglect of prayer wasn’t the sole cause of our troubles? (the one near hit of the lot). And again, whether if we had disarmed absolutely, the enemy would have dared to move against

us? A fairly typical modern sentiment was that God deals with souls but not with matter: and, like unto it, that He sees the individual but disregards the group, the nation, and the world!

I summarise these aberrations in the interests of science; a small-scale Gallup-poll, 1942. The kindest must agree that this orgy of strange opinion is the price, rather dear, we pay for freedom of belief. It means that millions are adrift, wandering stars, isolated atoms, without spiritual unity, and in two cases—a man of 71, “agnostic but Church of England,” and one of 52, “utterly sad and alone since I gave up religion”—the victims of our national Indefiniteness.

To each who included a stamp (and to a few wistful cases who didn't) I recommended some fit book; Dr. Downey's short work on “Divine Providence”; Miss Murray's “Good Pagan”; Illingworth's “Divine Immanence” and so on. But do these fugitives from the spiritual battle zone get them and read them? And still more, I wonder, do they *follow* the reasoning in them, lucid and simple as it is? I have doubts about it. For when people have picked up an easy, plausible one like prayer being needless because it is “telling” God what to do, or something already known to Him, they do not part soon with such a self-absolution from “wrestling” and effort. Every departure from truth nowadays, notice, is in the direction of *ease*, of *dropping* something essential (never an addition of thought or effort), of the line of less resistance, of escape, of virtuously blaming *others* for one's own lack of faith and interest. It is not the hearty, vulgar negation of last century when Haeckel and Ingersoll cocked a snook at mystery, miracle, the soul, and Providence. It is a mild, lukewarm decoction of that, and reflects a softness of the time, reflected also elsewhere. If in charity or curiosity you follow up one or two cases, in a step or two you find their views fluid and formless, and that they had not expressed their first hesitations and symptoms aright. I appreciate in a flash the grace which must be with our priests (and evidence speakers) when one elderly seeker assures me that the Catholic Church must be true and a providential fact since it has weathered 2,000 years of storm, in which all other institutions, and states, have foundered—but he cannot accept the miraculous element in the Gospels. One can tell he was brought up on one sort of popular science in the 1870's and 80's, and has stayed put.

From this inundation of strangers' confidences (elicited by something I had written) one emerges with passionate gratitude for the existence of the Catholic Church, philosophy and authority; for Reason; and for the grace to have asked, and persevered, and picked a way through catch-words and easy ways out. But again the searching question arises, *are* our people putting our own literature about, are they an apostolate in anything but name, and if semi-strangers ask them about any part of the Faith, can they and will they gamble with several hours of their time and a few pence on pamphlets and a few stamps for further correspondence? Or introduce them to a priest or instructed laymen who *will*?

What Conversion machinery and contacts have we for the vague inquirer who hangs about our book-cases and porches? None, that I have seen. Many churches lack even the fifty booklets of enlightenment; more lack anybody to commend them and receive a stranger. I speak from old experience. Outside, streams of sheep without a shepherd; inside, the shepherd: where is the *nexus*—an intelligent sheep-dog or two?

To-day, naturally, religion is coveted—or challenged—by those without it, on the side of Divine Governance of the world: of Providence, prayer, miracle, intervention, deliverance, consolation. Is this side of the Gospel put with particular force, and amplified to reach beyond the church doors? It is now the *preamble and first principles* of Christianity which call aloud for our defence and proclamation; and if Catholic logic and clarity can do this, the Church will benefit by it, and will really be leader of British religious thought. It is *foundations* we have to prove to the world; and then afterwards our precious distinctive doctrines of the Church, the Sacraments, Our Lady and the Saints. Yes, our apologetics will increasingly be, primarily, on Theism, and especially God's ways with mankind and the world. There is some quasi-Christian sentiment to-day which shrinks from belief in Divine intervention in His own physical creation (though immanence is easily held); and there is, or was, much frothy talk of man's "conquest" and "control" of the forces of nature from much the same people who could not discern control of all by nature's God! So rare is clear, consistent thinking. The silly fiction (first-coined as a paradox by Stevenson in an essay *On Walking Tours*) that "it is better

to travel than to arrive"; and the complacent conceit that "there may be more honesty in doubt than in belief" (why?) I have heard broadcasters, out for popularity, affirm. Travel without arrival is the worst of torments; and a sceptic proud of his honesty, and slurring belief, is already smug.

First, for the strange timidity about prayer and God's freedom to answer it by guiding outer events. The wooden old theory that "laws" manage things somehow, not God, is a spurious picture of an impossible economy. "Laws" can only mean the more *usual* way in which the Divine Will proceeds. In fact, enlightened logical scientists prefer to state that the laws of nature are "*tendencies* to uniform action." The law of gravitation works wherever we look: yet a simple flower "*defies*" or over-rules it by virtue of the Life in its tissue—lifts its head delicately and bravely in the teeth of that Force of Gravity which is complete master of the rocks and inorganic things. Just as Life modifies and overrides merely physical forces, so Mind qualifies and alters the biological working of animal life. And Spirit, too, enters mind to determine and re-shape it. So over *all* things, as Shakespeare saw, is "a Divinity that shapes our ends, rough-hew them how we will": elsewhere he calls it "fate and *metaphysical aid*." There is no law and no force which has not some superior law and force over it—till we come to the Final Cause and Mind, "the Free Will of the Universe," as Tennyson once described the Almighty. This world (as Browne put it) is "a manifest stair and scale of creatures and energies."

It is also something else we easily forget. With all its varieties of forms and manifoldness of actions, it is *One*—a vast inter-locking, inter-working Unity. Nearly everything has access to most other phenomena at some point, and influences them. The deeper biologists nowadays won't hear of the old-fashioned hard and fast distinction (or divorce) between Organism and Environment: because these two are so dynamically interdependent at every moment that they amount to a function of each other, and each has largely made or adapted the other. Theologians and moralists know how easy it is to stereotype an unreal gap between Soul and Body in practice: we never see matter working apart from Mind (human or Divine), and I for one have never seen Spirit at work except in and through matter—

even though it is the sensitised tissue of the brain. Then great play used to be made, by mechanists, with our old friends Cause and Effect: but most causes (all, in fact, except the Original) are effects of something antecedent, and most effects become in turn causes of some other effects. And *very* few effects are the bald result of merely *one* cause: more likely half-a-dozen have indirectly contributed.

We have divorced and split-up myriad phenomena and rich involved Reality into scores of fragments and words, for the sake of classroom simplicity or a laboratory job. Good. But then we've forgotten to put them *together* again, where they belong and where alone they function. Our minds are too often like a lecturer's table littered with spare parts, and limbs pickled in spirits.

But the huge, fluid reality outside us—the big World seething onward now and every moment—is impressively unlike that. At every instant there are a million wills, forces, ideas, currents, laws in course of variation, change and inter-change. The wide-awake scientist and philosopher now speak of “the contingent,” “the indeterminate”: Coventry Patmore speaks of “the wide vague field of Possibility”—that is, the many possible *alternatives* open every hour to a force or a will to be turned this way, that way, or several other ways: the man in the street says, from experience, “You never can tell”; the sage remarks, at some stage, “I won't prophesy”; an historian will tell you, “It's the Unexpected that happens.” Wavell in his masterly treatise on War catalogues some few of the humanly uncontrollable factors (other than strategy or supply) which we have to endure; and other moral and spiritual elements and risks which are unscientifically shelved as “accident” or “luck,” but which can with more cogency be classified in the older formula “act of God.”

The contagion of moods, human error, finite wisdom, the illness of a key-man in an army, the mentality of the people in whose country you are, an epidemic, a score of different weather phenomena, a speech, the appearance of a general as he visits his men, the *belief* in an Army—these and a hundred more subtle, unforeseeable imponderables help to decide wars and our destiny; yet we, of ourselves, are almost helpless in face of them! This vast decisive region of the Uncertain is the region, eminently, whence Divine Will and Providence operates and disposes the

determining things. He indwells *minds*; we know that. But minds alone do not shape history, victories or defeats. That shaping is largely in "plastic Circumstance" which Browning said "teems with witnessings of Providence." Many moderns, either religiously inclined or disinclined, seem inhibited from admitting a Divine *objective* power in and over all things *visible* and invisible, as ruler of heaven and earth. They seem to imagine "laws" are entities, which push matter, or direct events; or that "nature" is a person, a power, a goddess, or an independent deity! But the best science and thought now discern that visible (and semi-visible) forms of matter are, on analysis, only temporary states of *energy*; that energy would not exist, or would cancel itself out quickly, without *direction* and order; that order and direction necessarily imply Will and Intelligence, proportionate to the infinite scale of the cosmos, seen and unseen. Scrutiny still therefore leads "through nature up to nature's God." This latter-day subjectivism has to be watched. Otherwise it would sell the pass to quietism, pietism, and defeatism; it would "give up" the world to secularism, "force," "law," routine and the devil, and retreat into mystic emotion, "experience," and thousands of differing personal idealisms—which being false or half-truths would come to grief.

These retreats and surrenders must stop. The Catholic Church herself has of course never conceded one: she is firmly wedded to God's sacrament and creature Matter; hers is the religion of a glorified Body; she is herself the mystical Body; she saves, blesses and anoints bodies; she can consecrate *things*. That is why I love her and know her as incarnate truth; and why her complete witness always thrills and fortifies the man who can *think through*. She proclaims the *total* power of the Godhead, not a halved or eclectic divinity. I was actually told by an adherent of a certain modern theosophy or unitarianism, that it was "better than blank negation; it is a feather-bed for falling Christians!" It is a style of self-excuse too common. Our Lord forever proved the *identity* of Divine power over matter, force, events and spirit alike when he shocked certain prudes by openly forgiving sins: "That you may know the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive *sins*"—He said to the man sick of the palsy, "Take up thy bed and *walk*." There it is—spirit, matter; matter, spirit; two aspects of

the one reality. However *distinct* in nature, both utterly permeated and mastered by Him.

The wide uncharted field of hazard—unknown “circumstances over which we have no control”—is the infinitely various laboratory where He “shapes our ends, rough-hew them how we will.” A thousand unseen strings tremble this way or that—delicate balances sway inaccessible to us—sudden junctures and coincidences and surprises: and we are at their mercy. It is of hourly practical importance how we face these innumerable agencies. As trusting in matter and muscle and wits; in “luck”; or in the substantial truth—the supreme Control, God? Vulnerable men in this highly dangerous world, seething with risks and transforming forces, we have a solid gospel in the fact that the whole complex, protean, altering web of things is continuously sustained and conducted by *one* Mind equally present in *all* its natures and phenomena: not a Spirit whose action is confined to spirits but Master of the entire flowing, fusing, and weaving whole, in its permutations and combinations. Notice the fact which mature science now recognises—the subtle *continuity* of all things, however seemingly distant or unlike. (The curious causes which bring about terrific results would make a startling catalogue of Consequences, like Darwin’s casual connection between abundance of honey and the presence of cats; or the possibility of Helen of Troy’s features being slightly different making the whole difference to Greek history).

This world is *not* a mere warehouse accommodating thousands of separate and unrelated things: it is one inter-related working *organism*—inhabited by a Life-principle which educes *His* results over and through our ends (or in spite of them) “according to the operation of the power whereby He is able to subdue all things to Himself.” In this very plastic, malleable, fluid scheme “anything may happen,” where the adequate cause or will is present. Hence the vital use of prayer—its rôle and opportunity. Nothing could be more unfortunately clumsy and mechanical than the odd notion that we (who are not ignorant of science and philosophy, of history and men, of matter and force), in petitioning the Source and Ground of the Universe, the Author of moral personality, are naively attempting to coerce His Will! or are trying to bring “force” to bear. Here is the old vice of the mind not emancipated yet from

machine images. The crucial issues of life already exist, foreseen and understood, in the Mind which includes *everything*; all causes, energies, and conditions are in His sight and control. Well, prayer is just *one* of those foreseen, allowed causes in His omniscience. A wise human father, immersed in many affairs, can plan ahead for the good of his son or daughter, deciding for instance to give the youth some gift or privilege on his nineteenth birthday, certain conditions being first met by the youth: especially a courteous *asking*, both to show filial respect, and his sense of the gift's worth, and his own need. With the asking, yes: without it, no. *But* the wise father knows his own son (has trained him, has bequeathed him his mental traits), and is satisfied that the son will, in fact, make the request. And the condition being met, that special gift, one knows beforehand, is as good as made. Now that analogue of prayer is obviously an indispensable contributory *cause* of the gift being made. It does not violate any law or economy of the parents. The father's affairs would not suffer disorganisation whether the son is filial or churlish, whether he got the gift or missed it. It is the youth who would have suffered for not exerting the prescribed and wished effort.

Out of that enormous *fund* of what science calls "the contingent and indeterminate," where the odds are unascertainable by us, where everything is *in transitu*—ready to affect us well or ill, by the merest touch as it were of a hair-trigger—out of that deep abyss of alternatives innumerable, the Lord of every force can prefer whichever He will. And being Spirit, personal and moral, He will use the running cross-pattern of forces and events "to work together for good to those who love God." You and I have a routine in our lives; but we are not slaves bound to it. We like method and system because they usually assist our affairs, and to some extent help consistency of character. But to become *prisoners* of habit (even an orderly habit) when some great, unusual issue arises—that is moral failure. The routinier and precisionist may lose a war, a throne, a wife, a child, or a friend through rigidity and unimaginativeness. Uncommon occasions demand uncommon action; and that means *superiority* to commonplace action, it means improvising, it means creative originality, it means free assertion of personality. The Divine order in the universe is the normal and beneficent fact, enabling us to see a little ahead, and generalise:

it is a great part of Providence. But the absolutely free God has not to *obey* these sequences ! They simply express the decision of supreme Mind in the ordinary way of events. He is emphatically "above the laws"—in the sense in which I am above my usual habits when something more resourceful is called for ; and if the mere creature can extemporise special conduct at a given moment, assuredly the Creator can. Huxley was very severe with Hume for saying miracles were a "violation" of nature : this, he said, was a violation of language. The old-time mechanists never agreed on a definition of what is "Nature" and what is not ; is *man* part of nature ; and if so, is it his mind, or body only ; and what, further, of the spiritual man ? A flower may be called super-natural—if the stones and inorganic world could speak ; the plant would, if it could, regard moving quadrupeds as baffling miracles ; animals could only wonder at the "violation" of law involved in a bird's flight ; all animals would see the ability of fish to breathe under water and not drown, as a prodigy ; every other living thing could but regard Man—who cooks, uses fire, wears clothes, builds ships and ploughs, talks, laughs, writes things down, sings, plays instruments, invents games with rules, organises worship, and so on—as an incredible interloper from some unimaginable sphere, an alarming mystery, and something utterly *new*. Yet these outer manifestations of man pale before his inner moral and spiritual significance, which relate him closer to the Highest in the universe. From atom to soul, there is no violent or wide breach of continuity, though there are deep differences in kind. The mutual interplay of influence between them is constant and profound, and through them all lives the Living First Cause ; immanent yet transcendent, by virtue of whom things subsist and move at all.

Though petition for a Divine modification or guidance of external occurrence is only a portion of the wide activity of Prayer, it is a portion, and a legitimate one. And it is the sign, sometimes, of a shaky faith in God to withhold such petition as "unworthy" or "presumptuous." Surely it is unworthy and presumptuous to remove His physical universe from Him—as something He cannot modify or utilise in our interests ! *That* is the true impiety ; and one rejoices to see that in Catholic congregations prayer for a temporal favour, or a bodily deliverance or recovery, are habitual. And

so, significantly, are the thanksgivings which follow. Petition is instinctive in all religions of men—and it is a natural right, confirmed in hundreds of instances by Our Lord, to whom the needs of men however humble were never indifferent. To forego it, is to mutilate our religion, to rob it of an element of reality, interest, and love. It is an underestimate of the width and *elasticity* of the Eternal Purpose, of God's prevision and prevenience, and of our own filial rights. He, who is author of the body, the family, the nation, the world and its affairs, is not unconcerned about them: "He knoweth you have need of these things," and they will be added to those who seek Him and His justice. To assume our anxieties is *His métier*: "cast all your cares upon Him, for He careth for you." This is sound New Testament truth, as well as Old. The simple view is the profoundest after all. Just as the Blessed Trinity is undivided, as Christ is to us entire and undivided, so God's superintending power is one and integral, over a world which is many-in-one.

Here is *one* out of many paths into the Faith, sometimes discovered by people in time of danger and stress. *Then*, as Churchill said in his broadcast on Russia in June, 1941, "all men pray sometimes." Our present national effort would be immeasurably strengthened if a vastly increased number practised this view of prayer—the view which realises that it is a natural function, influence, or force quite as much as scheming, as bodily busy-ness, as tools, as petrol, as oratory, as propaganda, or electricity or other agency. It is *not* "outside" the Plan, but very much in it; "in the stream of life Divine." There are some minimisers left, I know, who have been brought up to see prayer only as a higher form of auto-suggestion; or as *solely* an act of resignation, as though the Lord's prayer had only one request, "Thy will be done," whereas it has other pleas to offer—for daily sustenance, for pardon, for freedom from too severe trial, and for deliverance from manifold evils. Catholic prayers ask for the prosperity of our undertakings, for bodily health, for our spiritual and temporal rulers, and for our enemies—not forgetting our friends, benefactors and defenders; for the living and the dead, the absent and the present. Rob prayer of any one of these solitudes, and it is a poorer thing. Not only that, it would be a more timid, grudging, and *sophisticated* thing. Who are *we* to edit and censor our statements of need, under the delusion that God cannot be

importuned about such things? The early Christians' prayer secured Peter's miraculous release from prison. Paul enumerates his many physical rescues and attributes them to prayer, his own and others. The saints adduce overwhelming testimony to the same effect. In real life, the saving of your body—your army—your nation—your house—may well be the sole way of saving *you* and your dependants for God's glory in the world; and it would be an artificial distinction to isolate the temporal from the spiritual. Christ repeatedly and pointedly used matter, touch, and physical means in many of His works of mercy. It is Catholicism's glory to emancipate men from *matter-phobia* and from splitting God's world into two, one alone important, the other run by some dark Fate or Necessity (which does not exist—there being no room for it). Let men merely read that amazing 11th chapter of Hebrews which tells how "by faith" men have performed wonders, and not solely spiritual wonders; and they should begin to be cured of this odd dualism—almost Manicheism—which banishes prayer to one day a week, or five minutes a day, to the sanctuary only, and as a devotional duty or luxury only, instead of being a virile, spontaneous relationship with the Giver of all things and the Hearer of all men.

Let us keep supple and receptive minds in this matter, agreeably to the subtlety, resourcefulness and elasticity of Divine Providence, moving easily along and across a thousand avenues of force—natural, human, moral and spiritual. When Our Lord prayed, He said: "All things are possible to Thee," and He repeated the statement in one of His parables. Divine Power, said St. Paul, is perfected precisely in human weakness. Men (especially men of active, unreflective races like ours) are so eager to do Providence's work for Him; Pelagius, the monk who falsely over-stressed man's share, was significantly a Briton! We primly inform each other that "God helps those who help themselves"—meaning often, I am afraid, that self-help really does it! as though He does not help those who *cannot* help themselves, which is just when His help is most needed and most Divine. We also say oracularly that "God works, you know, by means"—meaning often that the speaker is an indispensable, and forgetting that "He uses the weak things of the world to bring to naught the strong; nay," the Apostle adds in a wonderful hyperbole, "the things that *are not* to confound

things that *are*." It is true. From behind the veil of His counsel, He elicits small, unnoted factors which (all unknown to the noisy world) will dissolve many a stronghold, many a potentate, many a towering system which monopolises universal attention.

Just now the typical Briton and American concentrate with puckered brow upon the material gear which, as they hope, is going to swamp Shintoism and Nazism. Not so fast! Look out for "heathen heart that puts her trust in reeking tube and iron shard"; for the fatuous materialism that quotes billions of dollar votes, numbers of tanks, ships, and bombers, with rarely or never a "God willing" or "under Providence." *Total war!* Humbug, without the spirit's forces and a crusading fire. Our defenders and our captains, friends and allies, ought to be daily and constantly bathed by us in the prospering stream of intercession. *There* is the lubricant which will multiply the effectiveness of men and machine; there is the nexus that will fill up the unseen gaps in our human strategy and propaganda. Against the "heathen raging together against the Lord and His Christ," whom should we take with us into battle? The enemy's morale is fanatical: let our fanaticism be far stronger, purer, reasoned, and fed from the one true Centre, and be quite sure we can do all things through Christ who strengthens us. How pallid, old-world and shop-soiled in comparison are the appeals to "democracy" by elderly gentlemen to people, 80 per cent. of whom, especially the young, would not give a limb, let alone life, for democracy! They undergo privation of liberty and other things for "England," home, our own folk, or because of a *moral* abhorrence of a wildly wicked enemy: concrete things, which need basing, firmly basing, on the valid and Abiding.

W. J. BLYTON.

EDITORIAL NOTE

All contributions submitted to the Editor must be typed and be accompanied by a sufficiently large stamped addressed envelope—stamps (or Post Office coupons from abroad) alone will not suffice. Articles so submitted should be concerned with matters of general interest, and be the fruit of expert knowledge or original research. They should not ordinarily exceed 3,000 words, and must be intended for exclusive publication in the "Month," if accepted.

Literary Communications, Exchanges, and Books for Review should be addressed to The Editor of "The Month," 114 Mount Street, London, W.1, and not to the Publishers: Business Communications to The Manager, Manresa Press, Roehampton, London, S.W.15 who also receives subscriptions (14s. per annum post free).

THE DEADLOCK IN INDIA

COMMENTATORS on the failure of the Lord Privy Seal's mission to India were quick to seize on one salient fact and to derive from it what comfort they could. Now, it was declared, the honourable intentions of His Majesty's Government towards the peoples of India had been placed beyond all reasonable doubt; the offer of independence had been made in unmistakable terms and if certain reservations were added with regard to Defence this was rendered inevitable by the exigencies of the war situation and betokened no distrust in Indian capacity or intentions. Why, then, it was asked, did the negotiations break down?

The tendency at first was to find the cause of the deadlock in a corresponding lack of sincerity, political wisdom and good-will among the leaders of Indian political opinion. The failure to patch up communal quarrels—reduced in the perspective of World Quarrel No. 1 to relatively minor importance—seemed nothing less than criminal folly. On the other hand, there are those who feel that the situation would yet be saved, and India enlisted wholeheartedly in the cause of the United Nations, if the Government would yield generously to the demands of the Indian Nationalists. They rarely stop to ask whether such a facile "solution" is feasible and whether, if it were, it would have the desired effect. Accustomed to think in political terms for which the Indian situation provides no real parallel, those who reduce the whole problem to a matter of bad faith or insincere professions on one side or the other miss the true significance of the breakdown. The real truth that has finally been brought to light by the Indian rejection of the Cripps proposals is sufficiently familiar to anyone acquainted with the realities of the Indian situation. It is simply that, for the solution of the Indian problem, good-will and sincerity are of themselves not enough. Historical developments have to a large extent tied the hands of all parties to the dispute and make the way of compromise the only practicable one.

To the cartoon-mentality with its weakness for naive simplification the Indian situation appears primarily as the

familiar political problem of Imperialist domination versus the legitimate rights of a subject people. Over and over again one has been treated to the well-worn argument : The record of the British in India may be as impressive as you please ; it may be the fairest flower of benevolent administration but—the inevitable slogan—“good government is no substitute for self-government” ; the British have no right to be in India ; they should get out and leave India to the Indians. As for the domestic dissensions among Indians themselves, these minor strains will automatically disappear once the major tension is removed. Unfortunately for that point of view, no process of “leaving India to the Indians,” i.e., of conferring responsible self-government on the Indian peoples, has yet been devised which has not threatened to precipitate a major crisis in Indian affairs. The Cripps proposals mark the last of such attempts and though they have failed in their primary object, they have at least succeeded in convincing all but the most intransigent extremists in every camp that no satisfactory solution can be reached unless a certain realism goes hand in hand with good-will and sincere appreciation of Indian nationalist aspirations. And by “realism” is meant a respect for the hard facts of the actual situation, for the legitimate interests and responsibilities of all the parties concerned and for the true welfare of India as a whole.

In what follows an attempt will be made to give some account of the present impasse and to state the point of view of the principal parties involved. There are however a number of factors of wider import which are not always allowed their due weight when Indian problems come up for discussion ; with these we propose to deal in the first place.

They may most conveniently be introduced by the question most frequently put to those with some experience of life in India : “*Can India govern itself?*” No one has any doubt that India can provide an adequate supply of trained and talented administrators. The educated classes in India are a very small minority—it is estimated that over 90 per cent. of the population is illiterate—but an Indian minority can be, numerically, very impressive. To take a concrete instance. Among the educated classes, Indians with a University education constitute a still smaller minority. Yet look at the number and size of the Indian Universities ! India possesses 16 modern Universities, some of them vast

corporations with a gigantic student-roll. (Calcutta, for instance, has a student-body of about 27,000, distributed through its 58 affiliated Colleges). And as for the qualities of the Indian mind and character, the day has long gone by when the Indian of striking attainments could be looked on as something of a phenomenon. In every department of civilized achievement—in scholarship, law, science, medicine, art, engineering, commerce and public administration—India has produced a steady stream of brilliant personalities in no way inferior to the finest products of other countries. It would hardly be necessary to stress such a point were it not for the fact that one has met some astonishing survivals of racial prejudice as complacent as it is ill-instructed.

Usually in the mind of the enquirer it is not the capacity of the Indian to govern that is in question but the capacity of India to be governed by her own. Is India as a whole sufficiently advanced politically for democratic self-government? That is a vitally important question but the question itself rests on an assumption that raises the most thorny problems. It is assumed that the word "India" (like the word "England") stands for a country that has attained to a certain national unity, that can in consequence be thought of in some sense as *one* people. Self-government implies some sort of national "self" and it is only to the extent that that internal national unity is a reality that Swaraj can be a reality. Now is there among the peoples and races of India the sort of unity that can provide a real basis for democratic self-government? It cannot be too strongly emphasised that this is not an idle academic question introduced by the wicked British to justify the withholding of independence. It is an intensely practical problem over which the minds of Indians themselves are deeply divided. "Democratic systems, based on the concept of a homogeneous nation such as England, are definitely not suited to a heterogeneous nation such as India, and this simple fact is the root cause of all India's constitutional ills." Those are not the words of some Imperialist die-hard but of Mr. Jinnah, the President of the Muslim League. The view they express is repudiated, to be sure, by other Indians of weight and authority but it is a view that cannot be dismissed without consideration.

The guide-books and the lecturers will tell you that India is "a land of contrasts" and, certainly, the contrasts are wide enough and startling enough to impress even the most

incurious of cold-season tourists : the uneasy mingling of East and West in the great cities, the medley of races, creeds, castes and customs, the confusion of tongues, costumes and architectural styles—these are the things that strike the most casual eye. India's social and religious life, no less than her fauna, flora and physical features, conveys an impression of a rich and luxuriant variety that seems to defy every principle of unity. Nor should the scale of the problem be left out of account. In territorial extent, the sub-continent is the size of Europe minus Russia. British India with its 11 Provinces takes in a population of over 248 millions while "Indian" India, the 600 or so States under the rule of the Princes, has a population of about 80 million. (Some of these Indian States cover a considerable area ; Hyderabad, for instance, with its 12½ millions is about the size of Great Britain.) When it is borne in mind that among these hundreds of millions there are at least 7 radically diverse racial types, 10 different religions and about a dozen distinct families of languages, that the *summum genus* in each category proliferates into countless sub-species and varieties, and that these racial, religious and linguistic divisions are at the roots of the most bitter social and political strife, it becomes increasingly clear that behind the apparent unity implied by the use of the word "India" there shelter real and irreducible divisions. When, in addition, it is recognised that Indian society contains groups at every stage of social evolution from the Stone Age to the most advanced 20th century civilization, it is hard to understand how the Vice-President of the Hindu Mahasabha, could write to President Roosevelt that "it is historically and culturally untrue" to imply among Indians "lack of unity from time immemorial."

Indeed, the facts seem to support the contention that it was the British who conferred unity on India and that the things which still make for unity in that country—Government, Law, English political theory, education and language, to say nothing of the railway-system—are of British origin ; that, in a word, modern India as a political entity is a British creation. There is indeed little enough to support the favourite charge of the extreme Nationalists that the discord between Indians (and especially that between Hindu and Mussulman) has been perpetuated and fomented by British Imperialists for their own dark ends on the sinister principle of *divide et impera*. The charge stands in no need of refutation.

Even Mr. Gandhi was constrained to confess in his paper *Harijan* that the British are not to be blamed for the lack of unity among Indians and that the communal tangle would have to be straightened out before independence could be enjoyed. This last admission, running counter as it does to the official Congress thesis that Indians will agree among themselves when once the British yoke is removed, is highly significant as coming from such a source. As for Mussulman feeling on this point, we have had recently from Mr. Jinnah the categorical statement that "one Central Government will never work as a permanent Constitution in this country. I can understand the necessity of such an expedient during the War, but one united India after the War will never work. The differences between Hindus and Moslems are too great." The one way in which the British Government have been responsible for a heightened tension between Hindu and Moslem is, ironically enough, by the offer of independence! The promise of independence has been an apple of discord, and by the prospect of rival competition for the prizes of office mutual fears and jealousies have been intensified. It is precisely at those moments when steps are being taken to lead India a stage forward on the road to freedom—at the time of the Simon Commission, for instance, or of the Cripps scheme—that one is forcibly reminded that beneath the superficial, external unity imposed on India by the British Raj there are very deep fissures in the body politic.

But, it is asked, how deep do those divisions really go? In normal times and when political and communal feeling is not at fever-pitch, do not Indians manage to rub along together in business, social life and recreation, if not in perfect accord at least without notable disturbance? Racial and religious friction is not confined to India and in a country like the United States, for example, products of the most diverse stocks and creeds make a life of it together and turn out in the long run good Americans. What is there to prevent the Moslem, the Sikh, the Hindu, the Pathan from the mountain-barriers of the north as well as the Tamil from the jungles of the south, coming in time to think of themselves as simply "Indians," sons of the United States of India foreshadowed in the Act of 1935 or of the Indian Union projected in the Cripps proposals?

That is a consummation devoutly to be wished but for its realisation a long process of education is indispensable, and

the nascent Indian "nation," like a young man in a hurry, is impatient of delays. Save in the one universal demand for self-government, Indians feel themselves to be more divided than united. Even in a big University College where education and a common collegiate life have done much to break down barriers and breed a spirit of tolerance, it is not easy to get the members of different communities to mix socially, and the elections to such a non-political body as a Gymkhana Committee can bring to light the communal antagonisms smouldering below the surface. As for the common life of the country at large, where there is nothing to mitigate the disruptive force of primitive fears and hatreds, social life is in a state of dangerously unstable equilibrium. Between Hindu and Moslem, especially, peace seems to be little more than an uneasy interlude between outbreaks of violence. And it takes next to nothing (from the European point of view) to provoke an explosion. A Mussulman slaughters a cow—an animal sacred above all others to the Hindu—or a Hindu band plays outside a mosque, and the bazaars are forthwith in a ferment; murder, arson, looting and mob-law prevail until the police or, if the trouble has got beyond them, the troops restore order which lasts until such time as the protagonists are in the mood to start another fray. In passing, it may be remarked that it is not only those whose religious susceptibilities have been inflamed who participate in these communal disorders. Despite the great extension of law and order under the *Pax Britannica*, there are any number of wild and lawless spirits both in the city-bazaars and up country, and it is during communal rioting and non-co-operation disturbances that "the sons of Belial have a glorious time"; it is then the hooligan, the badmash and the dacoit come into their own. That is why non-violent non-co-operation passes swiftly from the spiritual plane of *satyagraha* to its usual results of violence and bloodshed. Mr. Gandhi himself has no illusions about this. More than once he has admitted that he has "underrated the forces of evil" and after the Prince of Wales riots in 1921 when the disturbances resulted in 53 dead and 400 wounded, he confessed that "I am more instrumental than any other in bringing into being a spirit of revolt, and I feel myself not fully capable of controlling that spirit."

From all this it would seem to follow that the only hope for India lies either in the continuance of the external unity

imposed by the British Raj or in the partition of the country into a number of autonomous units constituted on the basis of race and religion. The first alternative is against the declared policy of the British Government which wants to see India a free and equal partner in the Commonwealth and in any case has no supporters among the leaders of political opinion in British India or even among the bulk of politically minded Indians holding aloof from party affiliations. About this last point there can, I think, be little doubt in the minds of any who are in touch with educated Indians. The common people, especially the Untouchables, may feel themselves to be better off under British rule than they would be under Swaraj; the sentiment of loyalty to the Crown may still be strong among certain groups, but the vast majority of educated Indians are at one in their desire for self-government. At a condolence meeting held for Lala Lajpat Rai who died after being crushed in a crowd during a police charge at the time of the Simon Commission disorders, one was impressed by this sense of solidarity among speakers drawn from every community. One after another—Hindu, Parsi, Mussulman, Christian—paid eloquent tribute to the memory of the dead patriot, and every speaker sounded the same note—the burning desire in the Indian heart for the blessings of political freedom.

That sentiment is inspired by a variety of motives that sometimes escape the Englishman. Anti-Imperialism and anti-British feeling play their part but much stronger in the mind of such a man as Mr. Gandhi and those over whom he exercises such powerful influence are the spiritual and cultural issues involved. If we attempt for a moment to interpret that subtle and astute mind it is because he is still, for all the follies and inconsistencies of his practical policies, the greatest power in the land. No matter how much his purely political influence over the policies of Congress waxes or wanes, he retains an undisputed spiritual leadership over the Indian heart and mind. To the pious Hindu he recalls the memory of the virtuous and ascetic King Asoka and feeds the hope of another Golden Age. Like Socrates, he is a man with a *δαίμων*—an incalculable element that makes him something of an enigma not only to his opponents and his most intimate followers but even to himself. As Pandit Nehru has told us: "He admitted the presence of this unknown element in him and said he himself

could not answer for it or foretell what it would lead to."

Pandit Nehru has also confessed that he could never understand the background of Mr. Gandhi's thoughts, and that he resented his pre-occupation with non-political issues. Yet it is just here, in this passion for the spiritual values that give politics their meaning that we shall find the key to his mind. The strain of consistency in the Mahatma is to be found not in the things that he advocates but in the things from which he reacts. He is anti-Imperialist enough, but his war is chiefly with the materialist philosophy upon which, he believes, Western society is constructed; he believes that the over-industrialised, over-urbanised life of the West is a bad thing and does not mind setting the clock back to rescue his country from a like evil. With him, and not with him alone, nationalism and the fight for freedom is more an instrument of social philosophy than an expression of racial anti-British feeling.

To turn to the second alternative—partition of the country into autonomous zones, a project now embodied in the official programme of the All-India Muslim League and bitterly opposed by the National Congress and the Hindu Mahasabha. The views of the chief parties are expressed in their replies to the Cripps proposals which clearly envisage the possibility of partition. To understand these proposals and the reaction they provoked it is necessary to see them as the most recent effort of the Government to reach agreement with the Indian parties along the lines of a long-entertained and consistent policy. A brief outline of the course of events which have resulted in the present impasse and an account of the different interests involved will provide the right setting for a just estimate of the issues at stake.

There is, first of all, the attitude of the Government itself. This is determined by the demands of a policy implicit almost from the beginning in Britain's official relations with the Indian peoples and explicitly formulated with ever increasing clarity and emphasis in the course of the last 25 years. Within the framework of the Commonwealth, India is to enjoy fully representative and responsible self-government. Though Indian leaders have received the various declarations of Government policy with a caution little short of scepticism, both the intention and the bona-fides of the Government have been clear and unmistakeable. In 1917, Edwin Montagu,

the successor of Sir Austen Chamberlain as Secretary of State for India, issued as an approved declaration of policy the statement that "by measured degrees" India was to achieve self-government and so become "an integral part of the British Empire." In 1929, to remove the doubts and hesitations that the Simon Commission had sown in the Indian mind, the Viceroy (Lord Irwin) was empowered to declare that the ultimate and logical goal of the pronouncement of August 20th, 1917, was the attainment by India of Dominion status.

Nor were these official declarations a piece of elaborate lip-service to an ideal which the Government had no serious intention of realising. It is sometimes erroneously assumed that these "concessions" were wrested from a reluctant Government by the strength of Nationalist feeling. That is far from being the case. Despite the revolutionary violence of Congress agitation in India and the no less embarrassing jeremiads of certain reactionary circles at home, the Government proceeded steadily on its chosen course and, from the Montagu-Chelmsford Reforms embodied in the 1919 Government of India Act to the Federal Constitution of 1935, has taken steps to give practical effect to its declared policy; Indians enjoy a full measure of personal liberty and the transfer of political power has been both real and substantial.

In the interests of truth and realism, this last point deserves some stress. Misled by the brilliant flights of Indian political rhetoric, a sympathetic outside world has been led to believe that, ground down by the British heel, India writhes under a régime of ruthless oppression, cruelty and exploitation. The picture is wholly fantastic and demands a corrective. The Indian enjoys at least as much personal liberty as the average Englishman; his religious freedom is legally guaranteed and completely respected; he is even free to join political associations whose avowed object is the overthrow of the régime; he can do, say or write what he likes so long as he refrains from actions that are criminal or calculated to provoke grave public disorder. As for political freedom, India is to a very large extent run by Indians; there is a free franchise and, in normal times, government is carried on in the municipalities, in the Provinces and at the centre by representative democratic institutions. It is not too much to say that at whatever point the average Indian comes into contact with the Administration—in the law-courts,

in the municipalities or in the village panchayats—it is to the authority of his own people that he is subjected, and this, under a law before which he is equal and by which his liberties are guaranteed. It is understandable that Indians should want a control of their own affairs beyond that which they enjoy at present ; but it is simply not true to imply that every minute's delay in the transfer of that control means the perpetuation of a monstrous despotism. Other reasons there may be which make the immediate establishment of full self-government in India a matter of some urgency—the present war-situation, for instance—but that is another matter and does not alter the fact that, in normal circumstances, India is largely a self-governing country.

But the present circumstances are far from normal and that brings us to the situation which the Cripps proposals were designed to remedy. The Federal Constitution brought into being by the 1935 Act while placing a very large measure of power in the hands of Indians kept certain important departments—notably, Defence and External Affairs—in the control of ministers directly responsible to the Governor-General. Furthermore, certain emergency powers were left in the hands of the Governor-General and the Provincial Governors enabling them to govern independently if law and order, the rights of minorities or the States and certain other matters were in serious danger from the actions of Government. These reservations were bitterly resented especially by Congress and it was doubtful whether enough Indian co-operation would be available to make the Constitution workable. However, Congress did go to the polls (with the idea of wrecking the new Constitution from the inside) and achieved a substantial majority in 7 out of the 11 Provinces. In office, the Congress Ministries underwent a change of heart and settled down to work the Constitution. The years 1936-38 marked the high-water mark of co-operation. Then came the outbreak of War and with it the rapid deterioration in the Indian situation. India was declared to be at War by the Governor-General. Congress objected to such a declaration being made without ratification by the Legislative Assembly ; the inner command of the Congress Party called out its Ministries and, as other ministries could not be formed, the constitution was suspended in 7 Provinces and power taken over by the Governors in accordance with the provisions of the 1935 Act.

That was the position in 1939. Since then the march of events in the Far East has invested the situation with an added gravity. As the Prime Minister told the House of Commons when announcing the Cripps Mission in March : "The crisis in the affairs of India arising out of the Japanese advance has made us wish to rally all the forces of Indian life to guard their land from the menace of the invader." To achieve this end, the Lord Privy Seal took to India a Draft Declaration which proposed what amounts to a new deal with the peoples and parties of India. There was to be "the earliest possible realisation of self-government in India." A new Indian Union was to be set up—"a Dominion, associated with the United Kingdom and the other Dominions by a common allegiance to the Crown, but equal to them in every respect, in no way subordinate in any aspect of its domestic or external affairs." Immediately after the War, a constitution-making body was to be created and, between this body and His Majesty's Government, a Treaty was to be negotiated covering all matters "arising out of the complete transfer of responsibility from British to Indian hands."

The two provisions in the Declaration which at first set the Indian parties at variance with the Government and among themselves and were chiefly responsible for the breakdown of the negotiations were, first, the statement that His Majesty's Government "must inevitably bear the responsibility for and retain direction and control of the defence of India as part of their world war effort" and, secondly, the clause conferring the right of non-accession on any Province of British India not prepared to accept the new Constitution.

It soon became evident that the Defence issue was not the chief bone of contention. When the Government showed itself ready to place in Indian hands all matters of Defence which could "organisationally be separated immediately from the Commander-in-Chief's War Department," the Indian leaders adopted the line that the people could only be roused to the effective defence of their country and whole-hearted support of the War if led by a popularly elected National Government. This amounted to a demand, in the midst of war, for an immediate change of constitution.

That demand could not possibly be met, and the reason why is to be found in the past performance and present temper of the Congress Party itself. The Indian National

Congress, with its numerical strength of between 3 and 4 millions, is the most powerful political group in India. It may be said to represent purely political Hinduism and stands, on the whole, for complete independence from Britain. Though it accommodates within its ranks the upholders of many and opposed political doctrines, uniformity of action is ensured by a strict party discipline under zonal dictators. How effective that discipline is can be seen from the promptitude with which the Congress Ministries resigned at the orders of the Working Committee. A National Government on Congress lines would result not only in majority-rule by Hindus (which the minorities will not have at any price) but in the supersession of Parliamentary institutions by a Party Dictatorship. As Sir Stafford Cripps pointed out in his letter of April 10th to the President of Congress, Maulana Azad, "the nominated cabinet (nominated presumably by the major political organisation), responsible to none but itself, could not be removed and would in fact constitute an absolute dictatorship of the majority. . . . In a country such as India where communal divisions are still so deep an irresponsible majority Government of this kind is not possible."

Indeed, in the present temper of the conflicting parties, not only a single National Government but anything like a single Indian Union must be considered impossible. The Mussulmans will have none of it. The Muslim league "has finally decided that the only solution of India's constitutional problem is the partition of India into independent zones." Moslem India is loud in its call for "Pakistan"—the welding together of the Punjab, Sind, Kashmir, N.W. Frontier Province and Baluchistan into an independent Mussulman land and nation. To this scheme not only Congress but the Mahasabha (the party representing Hindu religious orthodoxy), the Sikhs (dissenters from Hinduism inhabiting part of the Punjab) and the "Moderates" are strongly opposed. Hence their objection to the "non-accession" clause in the Cripps proposals which clearly envisages Pakistan as a possibility. The option to secede is regarded as a threat to the unity of the nation. "The basic principle of the Hindu Mahasabha is that India is one and indivisible. In the religious and cultural aspect there has been recognised the fundamental unity of India by the Hindus throughout the ages."

And so we are back again at the point from which we started—the problem of the one and the many. *Is India "one and indivisible"?* The radical diversity of view revealed in the Indian reaction to the Cripps proposals is the best proof that she is not. In this article we have not ventured to weigh the merits either of the Government proposals or of the counter-proposals of the Indian leaders. What we have been at pains to show is simply that until Indians can compose their differences, no further advance seems possible; and it is a sign of happier things that in the minds of certain Indian leaders—Mr. Rajagopalacharia of Madras, for instance—this truth is beginning to prevail.

W. DONNELLY.

Heaven

HEAVEN shines over the mountains,
Earth with its glory pales.
Love is of Love begotten—
And sweet is the print of the Nails.

He came through the fragrant morning,
Treading the day new-born.
Light is of Light begotten—
And sweet is the print of the Thorn.

Down He came to the city,
To the city tortured and drear.
Peace is of Peace begotten—
And wide is the Wound of the Spear. . . .

Of Nails and Spear and Thorn-wood
Are a Shield and a Shelter made.
Home is of Home begotten—
And for all is a Table laid.

Heaven shines over the city;
Blood is the Vintage shed.
Life is of Life begotten—
And sweet is our Daily Bread.

MARY WINTER WERE.

THREE YEARS OF IT

JUST three years ago, when summer was already touched with the presage of autumn, Great Britain waited. It was a Sunday morning, bright and peaceful. News had been bad. The Germans had invaded Poland on the previous Friday. The moment was highly critical. Was it to be war again? And again war with Germany? The minutes between nine and eleven o'clock seemed to drag leaden feet. At eleven, Mr. Chamberlain broadcast to the nation. Then we knew. It was to be, indeed it had to be, war.

A young Englishman of twenty-eight can reckon that he has passed one full quarter of his life in a state of war with Germany. More than seven years of war—with the same enemy—and that enemy, fighting on the soil of other peoples, burning there, raping and murdering, in a spirit of violent and thoroughly inhuman aggression. It is not surprising that the great majority of Europeans and Americans regard both these wars as primarily German wars, that is, as worked for and brought about, by Germany. The guilt clause in the Versailles treaty rankled sore in German minds but more because they had been unmasked than because it was incorrect. And the grievances of Versailles were an excuse rather than the cause of the present conflict. It is not surprising that Europeans and Americans find it increasingly hard to make any distinction at all, so far as the German war-effort is concerned, between Nazis and non-Nazis. For they are convinced that they are fighting, not Nazis in Germany, but the entire German people, whatever be their opinion on more personal or sectional grounds, of their Nazi chieftains. And finally, it is equally little matter for surprise that the large majority of the human race are quite determined that German aggression is to be crushed once for all, and that another world-wide war must never recur.

The three years of war can be divided into obvious stages. First came the "phoney" stage, as the Americans called it. It was far less "phoney" than it looked or than the Allies thought it. Poland was overrun. The French reconciled themselves to a defensive policy and throughout a severe

winter they sat entrenched behind the Maginot Line, the people apparently unconscious of the ease with which it might be turned. The gospel of the defensive was loudly proclaimed, even by so-called experts: the military mind was obsessed with the now antiquated lessons of 1914-1918. It was an article of faith that the Germans could not break through the Maginot Line, and that the Siegfried Line, more hurriedly constructed, was equally impregnable. Stalemate—the Allies talked as though the war must end in this. Britain took things casually, with a dangerous unawareness of danger. Meanwhile, the Germans prepared or, better, pushed forward their already well-advanced preparations. During that winter their propaganda, assisted by that of the Communists, then on their side, worked cunningly among the Allied peoples, particularly the French. They had studied the technique of disintegration. Profiting by their military experience in the Polish campaigns, they were mass-producing tanks and planes. The "phoney" stage was won, and won decisively, by the Germans.

Attack in the West followed, heralded by the occupation of Denmark and Norway. Allied reverses in Norway forced a reconstitution of the British Government, and only just in time. The invasion of the Low Countries and of France was carried through with remarkable speed and efficiency, and with characteristic German ruthlessness. Away floated the Maginot mysticism like morning mist. Defence lines were improvised along the Somme—a substitute for Sedan and the Marne: Gamelin gave place to Weygand. It was too late. France was bewildered, France was disintegrating, France collapsed and signed its armistice. Britain remained practically alone. Her army had left most of its equipment on the Continent. With the loss of the French fleet and Mussolini's declaration of war in what he imagined were its concluding weeks, her navy's strength seemed stretched to almost impossible lengths. British doggedness, good fortune (another word for the Providence that guides man's destinies), and a wise Air Force policy saved Britain from what appeared inevitable. The battle of Britain was fought and won. Never had so many owed so much to so few—Mr. Churchill was right. It was this war's battle of the Marne.

The position was still desperate. Few friends of Britain overseas thought that she could retrieve the situation even if she succeeded in defending her own islands. The battle

of Britain was followed by a long winter when practically every night British cities were pounded from the air. Raid after raid—with little chance, as yet, of effective reply. This second battle of Britain failed too. The people "took it," to use a significant if silly expression. The grim atmosphere was somewhat lightened by a bold and gallant policy in the Mediterranean and by successful adventures against considerable odds in Libya and East Africa. But there we were fighting Italians who had no heart in the war.

On the continent, both fronts had collapsed. The German dread of two major fronts is well known. Now they had smashed both of them, and they were busying themselves with their proposed "New Order," their cherished scheme of a German-controlled Europe. In the West at least, they tried conciliation. They were polite, comparatively restrained, and brutal only on occasions. The policy was a strain and it did not last. In the East, the story was very different. Poland saw the true face of Germany while France and the Low Countries were looking at its western mask. Poland was prostrate, her territories and people partitioned between Germany and Russia. Prospects for the future appeared fantastic. Even supposing a German defeat in the end, how could one ever re-fashion East-Central Europe in the face of Russian as well as German opposition? Could one succeed in dislodging Germany from Western Poland, what likelihood was there of dislodging Russia from Poland's eastern provinces? Soviet Russia was then assisting Germany. A glance ahead, during that memorable winter of 1940-1941, did not encourage optimism. In the West, France had been defeated. Two-thirds of France was occupied: the Channel towns and ports were the bases for attack upon Britain; in the South, Pétain was attempting to rally Frenchmen to a provisional unity. Throughout that winter the British Commonwealth stood perilously alone, with the scattered remnants of European allies and the growing sympathy and help of the United States.

There is still a widespread opinion, firstly, that Germany has been phenomenally successful in this war and, secondly, that Nazi aims to-day are very different from those of the German leaders earlier in the century. This opinion happens to be false. To confine ourselves, for the moment, to the second half of it. In the spring and summer of 1941, Germany went East. This was a traditional move. It

was the old *Drang nach Osten*. All the old arguments about *Lebensraum* came into their own again. And they had now a finer opportunity of moving eastwards than during the war of 1914-1918. When opportunity did come their way during the earlier war, i.e., in 1917-1918, they were too exhausted to take it; they were too heavily engaged on the Western front. But first, they had to extricate their Italian helpmates from an awkward and undignified situation in Albania and Greece. This involved them in a Balkan campaign, with the frenzied destruction of Belgrade and a policy of open terrorism. It led to the attack upon Crete which worsened the British position in the Eastern Mediterranean but, at the same time, held up the intended German invasion of Russia. At last that invasion was launched. At the beginning it prospered; then it was slowed down in front of the great Russian cities of Leningrad and Moscow. The Germans had badly miscalculated the Russian strength and cohesion. As in the battle of Britain, so here they very nearly succeeded, but not quite. And in total warfare a near success is frequently a total failure. Once again, there was a continental land-front. By the coming of winter, the Germans had not attained either of their main objectives: they had not destroyed the Russian armies, and they had not occupied Moscow or Leningrad. Winter set in, and they suffered bitterly from the Russian weather and from local counter-attacks.

The closing month of 1941 brought the war into its present and thoroughly world-wide dimensions. Japan had hesitated for a long time. Finally, she hurled a sudden and treacherous attack at American naval bases. Like Germany, she nearly succeeded—in the long run, she will have failed. Had Japan seized the British possessions in the Far East after the fall of France, had she occupied Hong Kong and Malaya when she for practical purposes occupied French Indo-China, there could have been little British resistance, far less than there actually was a year afterwards. What is more to the point, it is almost certain that such a seizure of British territory would not have brought the United States into the war. American isolationism was still strong; and it would have been argued that American interests were not directly concerned. From her own selfish and imperialistic point of view, Japan acted late and even then attacked the wrong Power. The United States were now at war—with Germany

as with Japan. With the possible exception of the Argentine, all the South American countries were favourably disposed towards their great northern neighbour. Brazil and some of the smaller Latin American States have since declared war upon the Axis. Finally, the Chinese-Japanese conflict has now definitely become part of the world war.

The situation has changed out of all recognition since that perilous winter of 1940-1941. Then Britain and her sister countries in the British Commonwealth stood on their own, facing the concentrated and well-organized might of Germany. Under the German heel were friendly continental countries; to the rear of Britain was a friendly and helpful America. To-day, as we enter the fourth winter of the war, Russia, China and most of the American continent are at war with Germany. Germany has now an ally in Japan, powerful in numbers and immediate war preparation but, in the long run, highly vulnerable and unable to render Germany any direct assistance. On the mainland of Europe, Italy, Rumania, Hungary and Slovakia are less important allies that vary considerably in their attachment to Germany's cause. The resources of the Allied Powers are naturally far superior to those at the possible command of Germany and Japan, but they have required longer time to organize and develop. They are scattered, and cannot be easily collected and concentrated, depend upon sea-power and shipping resources. In the end, however, they must prove decisive. A glance at the world's map or better still at a globe is highly significant. The war began as a European struggle arising from the determination of Britain and France not to tolerate German aggression against yet one more people, the Poles. It has developed into a true world-war. A large proportion of the countries of the world are fighting against two relatively small centres, Germany and Japan—centres that for decades have been highly organized for little more than aggression and destruction.

I have questioned the judgment that Germany's military *success* has been phenomenal. Certainly her efforts have been so, but that is not the same thing. She has adapted her entire national life for purposes of war; she has invaded and occupied or partially occupied a dozen countries. But only in one case, that of France, was her military success unexpected. Indeed, looking back, one cannot avoid the feeling that it was not so unexpected in British Governmental

circles as it was to the public generally. We were all under the spell of the *mysticism du défensif* and we did not know that French politicians had left the Maginot Line unshielded and turnable at its northern end. But, as far as success is in question, Germany lost both battles of Britain. Her ceaseless warfare on Allied shipping, though it has taken a severe and serious toll, has not proved in any way decisive: and, with all its ebb and flow, this struggle is slowly turning to the Allies' advantage. The 1941 campaign in Russia, in spite of vast destruction and the capture of Russian material and natural resources, failed of its double purpose and there is no indication that the summer campaign of 1942 has fully succeeded or is likely to succeed. In other words, Germany's success has been very striking *up to a point* but, with the exception of the French campaign, it has not been sufficient to achieve victory. Success of that kind is not enough. Indeed, a prophet might well commit himself to the statement that Germany cannot now win the war. German successes have not been turned, and cannot now be turned, into victory. The problem that remains is whether the Allies can turn past defeats into present and future successes, and ultimately into full victory.

A number of features of our three years of war call for special comment. The first is the deterioration in the German handling of occupied peoples, even in the West. When fighting ceased—in the Low Countries and France—there was no deep and widespread hatred of the invader. The inhabitants were confused and bewildered and were relieved that actual hostilities were over. This was as true of France as of Belgium and Holland. There remained some ugly memories but a prudent policy might have softened these. It was taken for granted that Britain could not hold out much longer or, even if she did, could lend no effective aid to Europe. The Germans launched their long-prepared scheme of the "New Order"—a *Pax Teutonica*, with Germany at its centre, economically and politically. For smaller countries the scheme had some initial attractions. It offered economic advantages and some possibility of return to normal existence. And, in addition, such countries were weary of the uncertainties of the pre-war years. There was a chance that the Germans might win over the bigger business interests in occupied areas, and this they have to some extent succeeded in doing. But gradually the tide turned. Britain did hold

out ; the United States, with its immense prestige on the continent, was helping Britain and was eventually to join Britain. The German " quisling " parties proved ineffective and increasingly unpopular. Throughout the whole of Europe no man of honour or decent standing would associate himself with them. The German veneer soon wore through. The " New Order " became the rule of the *Herrenvolk*. What the invaders had hoped to secure through the guise of co-operation in the " New Order," must now be demanded in the name of the conquering master-race. Hostages were taken, hostages were shot. The countryside was scientifically pillaged. Minorities like Jews and so-called Communists were treated with particular brutality. This, mind you, in the West. The record in the East, in Poland, Slovenia and Czecho-Slovakia, was far more inhuman and barbarous. Hundreds of thousands of Slavs and Jews were evicted from their homes and cities and herded together in destitution in selected ghettos. A deliberate attempt was made to destroy the cultural life of the Polish people and to reduce them to the status of serfs for the *Herrenvolk's* convenience. Professors, artists, writers were driven into concentration camps. There was a quite explicit persecution of religion, both of Protestants and of the Catholic Church.

The tale of German brutality in East and West is a sickening one. Terrorism has been made a weapon : it is part of the total warfare that Germans have long preached and now ruthlessly practised. It is a weapon that only thoroughly unscrupulous men would employ, and even these should be careful to employ it only when they are sure of victory. The Germans began to wield it when they no doubt felt certain they would win the war : in their minds it was an instrument to bring victory nearer. In more recent months, though they have made more extensive use of the terror weapon than before, they are being warned by Dr. Goebbels that they must fight to the bitter end : otherwise, their defeat may spell at least partial extermination ; their own weapon may be turned against themselves. Dr. Goebbels has proved a poor prophet in his day. Here, however, he has touched upon an appalling possibility with greater realism and sensitiveness than he understands. Throughout Europe there is gathering a storm-cloud of hatred—hatred of bullying, oppression and savagery—hatred of everything associated with the German name : and this cloud may one day roll

across Germany and burst in frightful tempest over that unhappy land.

It is not a question of simple revenge but of a mass human anger against the perpetrators of horrible and obscene crimes. The German leaders might profitably ponder over the lament of Meg Merrilies, uttered when the gipsies were driven away from Ellangowan. "This day have ye quenched seven smoking hearths—see if the fire in your ain parlour burn the blyther for that. Ye have riven the thack off seven cottar houses—look if your ain roof-tree stand the faster. Ye may stable your stirks in the shealing at Dernclaugh—see that the hare does not couch on the hearthstone at Ellangowan." There is even evidence that the Nazi leaders are beginning to be worried about their own subjects. Hitler has always preached—and quite possibly believed—the legend of the *Dolchstoß*, namely that Germany lost the war of 1914-1918 through the failure of her civilian morale. This legend is false. The German armies were beaten in the field: whence the revolution. The legend was invented to save the face, and to restore the shaken prestige, of the German militarists. At present, the Nazis are organizing and equipping a formidable S.S. army behind their lines. Its avowed purpose is to guarantee order and obedience, in Germany as in the occupied countries. Its function will be to see that German civilian morale does not break. Unfortunately, its formation and existence are an almost sure sign of further terrorism in occupied lands and a fairly certain herald of civil war—very violent civil war—in Germany.

As one looks back over the past three years, certain points seem to disengage themselves. The first is that an Allied victory is essential. As long as Germany is Nazi-led, Nazi-inspired and Nazi-educated, no negotiated peace is possible. It would be an armistice, not a peace. You may reply that only a negotiated peace can, in the long run, endure. That is quite probably true. But not a peace negotiated with a Nazi-directed or, I think, for that matter, a Prussian-controlled Germany.

In the second place, the war cannot be brought to a successful end till the Germans are made to realise that war, as an instrument of national policy, simply does not pay. The last three German wars have been fought, and designedly fought, on the soil of other peoples. France, Belgium, Russia, from 1914-1918, and now France, the Low Countries, Poland,

the Balkans, and again Russia. Everywhere devastation, pillage, violence—everywhere, that is, except within Germany, the main centre and source of this frightful war spirit. The Germans must be taught that war is a hateful, abominable, destructive thing.

In the third place, there is the problem of this growing anger and hatred. You cannot do much with a storm except canalize its more dangerous possibilities through a lightning conductor. The only lightning conductor that I can see is found in the declaration of Allied leaders that crimes in the occupied countries will be severely punished. Those evil men who are chiefly responsible for the terrorism and atrocities of the past two years must be speedily tried and punished, either by their own countrymen or by the Allies. Of the two courses, the former is preferable. But one of the two must be swiftly and relentlessly adopted. Otherwise there will be massacres in Europe.

Whatever is done at the immediate conclusion of the war, can be regarded only as a temporary expedient. There will have to be an armistice settlement to remain in force for three years or more till conditions return to something like a human normal. Germany and Japan must be sufficiently disarmed to render them innocuous to their neighbours. Economic relief will be the first and most pressing problem. The peoples of the continent will require feeding, housing, repatriating; they will need social and medical attention. Property must be disgorged, houses and cities made habitable, prisoners restored to health and liberty. It is to the great credit of Britain and the U.S.A. that they are facing these various problems now and are already preparing means and methods of relief.

Coupled with this is the further problem of spiritual disarmament which Pope Pius XII insists is necessary for any peaceful order and for any scheme of material disarmament. Its solution will provide a long and arduous task. Hatred will have bitten deep, cruelty will rankle fiercely. Re-education is called for, among the Allies and the occupied peoples since, however strongly they may react against war's degrading effects, these effects are inevitably there, and still more in Germany. I have heard far harder things and far more violent things said by Germans before the war about their own young generation than ever I have heard during the war from their enemies. To de-Nazify the German youth and early manhood would seem a Herculean labour—in a century singularly deficient in characters of that sort. And

yet the work has to be done. One of the most important considerations of the armistice period will be a commencement of that re-educative process which must be undertaken by those Germans with whom we are to make the peace. A German people, sighing for Hitler as a "lost leader" and looking, with a martial nostalgia, to the days when they rode over Polish plains and Russian steppes, will have no temper for a prolonged peace.

And finally we must all—and especially the Americans and ourselves—look ahead to years of sturdy effort and sacrifice and prepare our minds and characters for a heavy burden of responsibility. It may well be that one of the reasons for the failure of the Versailles peace was the haste of the Allied peoples to be rid of war and war's problems. War was a frightful interlude that was best forgotten as soon as possible. Its lessons were only half learnt: its problems were never clearly confronted. Twenty-five years ago, we had won the war: gradually we lost the peace. This war too we have to win. Victory is essential. But, as Mr. Roosevelt has recently told us, victory is not enough. It must lead onwards, steadily onwards, not to a crazy or cloud-cuckoo world—the kind of thing we may solace ourselves with in the deepest stress of war—but to a sober, strenuous, unselfish world, in which it will be all men's gravest concern to work for decency and justice, for understanding and for peace. Such work can never prosper as it ought, without the inspiration and comfort of the Christian faith, without the guidance that is given by Christian principles and standards, without those spiritual motives for endurance and unselfishness which only the service of God and faith in Christ can adequately supply.

One helpful sign during this war has been the willingness of people in Britain, as also in the Commonwealth and the United States, to turn back to Christian principles, however broadly and even vaguely they may interpret them. The Pope's Peace Points were widely welcomed here and, among non-Catholics as among Catholics, there has been much genuine heart-searching into social and national problems. These are happy omens. When the years come for that great constructive work which will be imperative both at home and abroad, great numbers of our people will be the better trained to face it because, in their time of trial, they turned to these Christian principles.

JOHN MURRAY.

CRYPTO-CATHOLICISM, ENGLISH AND SCOTTISH

WRITING from England to some undisclosed correspondent of his at Rome towards the close of the year 1606, Fr. Robert Jones, S.J. indulged himself in a deep growl which, we hope, proved good for his complaint. For he was without doubt exceedingly peeved. One damnable trouble after another, one seems to hear him say. Less than a year ago the Catholic "Left Wing" had let themselves be duped into staging a murderous plot against King and Government. Within a few months had come the royal reply to the "powder traitors," a fresh addition to the already unconscionable burden of Elizabethan repression—Pelion piled upon Olympus. The Oath of Allegiance too—a subtle composition, expressly calculated to sow discord in the Catholic body.

Yt is scarce credible, wrote Fr. Jones, what difficultie we have to keepe up and underproppe poore afflicted soules from ruin and falling into errors and disorders, and all by reason of these late cruel lawes: but amongst all our troubles and crosses for Christ the most bitter and intollerable and most dangerous is the doctrine of Fa Thomas Wright who allowes and forcibly persuades men to goe to the churche, there forsooth not to hear service, but to hear sermons, and so seemeth to found a new sect, which maye be called the sect of sermocinants or sermonists; and because sermons are not comonly but at service time yt cometh to passe that infinite multitudes rune to service and sermons, liking well of this doctrine tending to libertie and terrene humors. He growndeth his opinion upon Azor who doughtlesse gaveth him great scope and occasion to work this newe towre of babylon.

So Fr. Jones continues at some length to descant on this "newe fangle" of Dr. Wright, formerly a Jesuit, and professor of scholastic theology at Louvain: "a distinguished theologian," the Third Douai Diary tells us, "who after

numerous discussions in England with the heretics, in which he gloriously confuted them both by word and by his writings, was at length sent from prison into exile." That was three years ago, in 1603. Now he is back again and—at a particularly unfortunate moment—is encouraging his co-religionists (so Fr. Jones would have it) to make the best of both worlds and pamper their terrene humors.

And truly for this newe fangle of going to churche to heare sermons, the honor of god (in my opinion) and the good of soules, and the credit of our cause formerly defended, should move our superiors to seeke some remedie, and to send some autentick declaration in this matter and the like of that nature, for wante whereof, as I have hard with my owne eares, many catholikes will not stick to saye that there is no more care had of them there with you for directions in such weightie matters than of dogges.¹

Actually, the Brief of Paul V "ad Anglos Catholicos" (22nd September, 1606) was already on its way to England whilst Fr. Jones was thus complaining. In it he would perhaps have found the "fitt remedie" he was demanding, on the subject of church-going no less than on that of the new Oath. But medicine, of course, must be accepted and swallowed before a cure can come about. As is well known, there were several in England—the Archpriest included—who shook the bottle vigorously, smelt it dubiously, and then reverently replaced the stopper. Not so the moralists of the period. With this Brief to guide them, they no longer provided any support for the views of Dr. Wright and those other priests who thought as he did. Sanchez, for instance, in 1614, and Castro Palao (1631), compatriots of Azor, and in Germany the great Laymann (1625)—to name but a few—all refer to Azor's opinion on this subject of church-going, but only to reject it as improbable and impracticable. And in this their views are in alignment with the traditional teaching and practice of the English missionary priests.

But what was this opinion of Azor on which, says Fr. Jones, the "newe towre of babylon" was being based? Fr. Juan Azor's work, the *Institutiones Morales*, was the "latest" on the subject: the first volume (which alone concerns us)

¹ Stonyhurst MSS. Angl., vol. 3, No. 66: Fr. R. Jones to —, 2nd October, 1606.

was published in Rome in 1600 and in Paris the following year. Dr. Wright may well have seen a copy during his exile abroad. In a chapter¹ dealing with the external profession of one's Catholic faith the Spanish Jesuit, having set down the usual principles and distinctions, turns to the solution of some special cases. Suppose, says he, that an heretical ruler issues a general order, to Catholics and non-Catholics alike, that they must periodically be present in heretical churches whilst services are being conducted or sermons preached. Suppose too that confiscation of property or even death be the punishment prescribed for failure to comply with his order. What then? Well, says Fr. Juan, it all depends. . . . What is the intention of the Ruler? If his object is merely to enforce civil obedience, then a Catholic may with a clear conscience obey. But if his purpose be to compel the profession of heresy, or by such means to discover who are Catholics and who are not, then compliance will be sinful. Church-going in such circumstances would amount at the least to a tacit profession of heresy, and scandal would undoubtedly be given to other Catholics.

So far, so good. The intention of the English Government being clear enough, the recent statute (3 Jac. I. c. 4) must be disobeyed. Compliance would involve a two-fold evil—tacit denial of one's faith, and scandal. But Fr. Azor was not content to end here.

You may ask, would it be lawful in such a case [as the above] to obey the order of the Ruler, if you were to make publicly a protestation that you were acting only in deference to your Ruler's command, and not by way of professing an heretical religion? There are some who hold it would be lawful for the purpose of preventing the confiscation of your property or the loss of your life: and this opinion certainly seems to be a probable one. For by such public attestation you are taking due precaution in regard of scandal and danger to other Catholics, and you are justified in avoiding the Ruler's unjust interference with your rights.

Whatever may be thought of the logic of Fr. Azor—and Dr. Wright would seem to have found no fault with it²—

¹ Azor: *Instit. Morales* I, Lib. 8, cap. 27, q. 5.

² Fr. Azor himself in his third volume (1611), published five years after the Brief of Pope Paul. V, seems deftly to contradict what he said in Vol. I, but without admitting the fact. But the reader can judge for himself; see Tom. III. Lib. 1, cap. 7, post quaest 2.

the solution is surely most hazardous as applied to the vivid reality of the English scene. A tempting solution, no doubt, in those difficult days, but beset with practical objections. A public protestation, for instance, if it is to eliminate the danger of scandal, will almost necessarily be so public as to defeat its own object and betray the protester as a Catholic. Nor would the avoidance of scandal save the church-goer from the personal danger of gradual perversion. A remote danger, perhaps, in the case of the more steadfast and well-instructed: indeed, as we shall have occasion to note, the suggestion was made in Scotland that only such should be allowed to attend occasionally an heretical sermon. But, with ruin of fortune and of home as the bitter alternative, who could maintain such a class distinction intact? What is good for the goose is good for the gander: and sooner or later the ganders would be sure to crash in.

Such-like considerations may serve to explain the stand made by the great majority of the clergy, secular and regular, in England against all attendance at Protestant churches. They had so acted for many a long year before ever the Brief of Paul V had made its appearance. But in Scotland matters had developed in a different fashion. Dr. Wright's or Fr. Azor's views were by no means "new-fangled" across the border. Dr. John Southcote, the friend and at a later period the secretary of Dr. Richard Smith, Bishop of Chalcedon, noted in his so-called Diary the Scottish method of procedure. He tells how the English Jesuit, Fr. Holt, by order of Fr. Persons,

passed into Scotland [in 1581], whither were sent three old Jesuits of good reckoning, Fa Cryton, Fa Hay and Fa Gordon. These three Jesuits took another course for converting Scotland than the secular clergy of England had done for England, using more profane and corrupt policy. They gave the Catholics leave to go to Church with heretics and to communicate with them in their heretical service and sermons, teaching that there was no sin but scandal.¹

The three Jesuits in question would of course have justly objected to this exaggerated way of putting it—they might even have resented the imputation of being "three old Jesuits." Of Fr. Gordon Huntly especially (he was 43 when

¹ C.R.S., Vol. I, p. 111.

he landed in 1584 and had taught theology for some ten or fifteen years) it may be presumed that he could draw the necessary distinctions essential to the subject. And he had as a Superior to guide him Fr. Edmund Hay, a man of acknowledged prudence as well as piety, who in France had already held in succession the responsible offices of Rector, Provincial, and Chancellor of a University. Fr. Creighton too had something like twenty years of Rectorship behind him. Apart from Dr. Southcote's reminiscences of what he had heard as a young man some forty years previously, we have the contemporary evidence of Fr. Holt, from whom we learn that crypto-catholicism was in full vigour at the time of the first coming of the Jesuits to the Scottish mission. He, an Englishman, with Fr. William Watts, a secular priest, had crossed the border into Scotland towards the close of the year 1581: for some years he had been the only Jesuit priest in this mission-field. A few, a very few of the old, pre-Reformation Scottish priests were still at their posts. The Spanish ambassador in London, on information gathered from Fr. Holt, reported that there were not more than half a dozen of these priests in Scotland, and these were very old and poor.

(Fr. Holt says) there is a great abuse among the Catholics, but whether it arises from the laxity of the priests or the ignorance of the people he does not know, namely, that whilst they secretly worship as Catholics, they openly are allowed to attend the preaching of the heretics, and it is believed that even some of the heads of them do this.¹

It must be remembered of course that the circumstances of Scotland were not quite those that had become so common in England. It was to *sermons* that the Catholics of Fr. Holt's acquaintance had apparently been permitted to listen. In Presbyterian Scotland the sermon was not, as the Englishman, Dr. Southcote, may have envisaged it, but a part of a larger service. It was usually the *pièce de résistance* of the service, if not the service itself. The Scots minister was, above all, the preacher, the "minister of the word"; often enough a 'hot gospeller,' with a capacity of retaining heat over protracted periods of sincere, impassioned oratory. One may gather the spirit of their services from the enactments

¹ Span. Calendar. III, 288: Mendoza to Philip II, 9th February, 1582.

of the First Book of Discipline : ".In great towns we think expedient that every day there be either Sermon or Common Prayer. . . . The day of publick Sermon we do not think the Common Prayer needfull to be used, lest we should foster the people in superstition who come to the Prayers as they come to the Mass. . . . Four times in the year we think sufficient for Administration of the Lords Table."

However this crypto-catholicism may have worked out in practice—and the dangers for many Catholics of even occasional attendance at these sermons, at once denunciatory and propagandist, are obvious enough—we know that the early Jesuit missionaries in Scotland were willing to allow the continuance of the practice which they had found on their arrival. Listen, not to Dr. Southcote's perhaps somewhat biassed account of the matter, but to the Scots Jesuit, Fr. Robert Abercrombie, describing the Catholic situation as he found it in 1588 when first he landed. His arrival with his companion Fr. William Ogilvie brought the Jesuits that year up to the respectable number of eight, including the "three old Jesuits" already mentioned.

At that time there were three different kinds of Catholics. There were some who were not afraid to profess openly the Catholic religion : and so they did not attend either the churches or the sermons of the heretics. Others there were, Catholics in reality, who yet went to hear the heretics' sermons, for fear rather than for liking, so as to preserve their fortunes and worldly goods. Of these the number was great, and it still is. And then there were the neophytes, recent converts, of whose Catholicism the ministers had no knowledge nor the people, but we alone. Of this kind there is always a certain number. All these were admitted by our Fathers without any difficulty or hesitation to the sacraments of the Catholic Church. The result was that, though we were at this time not very many in number, yet we reaped a rich and abundant harvest.

It was by a mere accident, he goes on to narrate, that a different mode of procedure came to their knowledge. Several years later—probably in 1596 or 1597—there arrived in Scotland, en route for England, some four or five priests from the English College at Rome. The young priests were

critical, it would seem ; knew precisely the "best" method to follow, which was the English method—namely, to refuse the sacraments "to any who should enter the churches of the heretics." Humbly these older and experienced missionaries at first accepted and adopted the advice so freely offered. The result, says Fr. Abercrombie, was disastrous, and the Jesuits came in for some bitter comment. Satan himself, they were told, could not have invented a better way of hindering the salvation of souls. So on second thoughts . . . —but a rumour, he says, had reached them that the General had made some pronouncement on the subject. Would Father General kindly send some authoritative direction?¹ After some months came the reply. The young English priests had given the right solution. But "the solution was not mine but Cardinal Allen's, and no doubt according to the mind of the Pope" : his Holiness however shall be informed of these Scottish difficulties.² So the matter seems to have stood for the time being. If the English practice continued to be followed—as apparently it did—it was not without serious misgivings. The General had disclaimed responsibility, or had cast the onus of it upon the late Cardinal Allen. But what knowledge of Scotland had the Cardinal ever had? And what authority over Scottish Catholics?

The subject crops up again about the year 1602 in a Report of the State of Scotland composed for the Jesuit General by Fr. Abercrombie, still Superior of the Scots mission :

One thing in particular we all earnestly petition—that to certain individuals we may be allowed to give permission to attend on occasion the sermons of the heretics, in cases where there will be neither danger of perversion nor scandal. . . . It seems to me that many of our theologians would allow this without much difficulty, were they in our position ; in the same way as did our theologians in Lithuania, Prussia and Poland, when I was there. They used to send their students to listen to the heretics' sermons. Why then may we not give similar leave to certain of our spiritual children whom we know will take no harm therefrom, but on the contrary will observe and note down many points

¹ Rom. Arch. S.J. : Anglia 42, f. 94 v. : R. Abercrombie to Aquaviva, 22nd July, 1598.

² *Ibid.*, Fland-Belg. i. 701 : Aquaviva to Abercrombie, 14th November, 1598.

that will show up the errors and false doctrine of the ministers, for the information of the less well-instructed.¹

One might multiply quotations to this same effect, taken from the letters of the Jesuits in Scotland during succeeding years, until Fr. MacWhirrie's death in 1606 and the retirement abroad soon after of the two "old veterans," Fr. Abercrombie and Fr. Murdoch, left the mission Jesuit-less for awhile. The three of them were at one in their views on this subject. Twenty Jesuits would not be too many, wrote Fr. Murdoch, on hearing of a proposal to send more missionaries to Scotland,

provided they have sound knowledge of their work, and that they come with full power to admit to heretical sermons those under their charge who they judge will not lapse into heresy, on condition that they attend only occasionally, and come to us every month to give an account of themselves. It is by such means that we have succeeded (*quo medio vicimus*).

He adds that when he uses the word "sermon" he means sermon, and not the prayers and other rites "in which the gist (vis) of the heretical religion consists."²

The General, Fr. Aquaviva, remained adamant to all these expostulations. And to us, more than three centuries after the event, it may appear indeed surprising that these earlier Scottish Jesuits did not see things as we see them, or think we see them, and as Aquaviva saw them from Rome. There was no difference of opinion, of course (whatever Dr. Southcote may have thought) as to the underlying principles. Formal co-operation in evil, the dangers of perversion or of scandal . . . such matters belong to the elements of moral theology. It was a question, not of principles, but of the practical application of those principles to local circumstances. Normally at least, the men on the spot are reputed to be the best judges of local conditions. Were they so in the case of Scotland?

¹ *Ibid.*, Anglia 42. f. 152 v. Fr. Forbes-Leith has translated part of this document (Narratives of Scot. Catholics, pp. 269 *sqq.*), where unfortunately he conveys the impression that it was the work of Fr. Alex. MacWhirrie, S.J. Apart from the original endorsement, which is clear, we have the words of the writer himself—but in a passage which Fr. Forbes-Leith has omitted: "We are four in number: William [Murdoch] and I, two veterans; a younger father, Alexander [MacWhirrie]; and the fourth a novice. . . ."

² Rom. Arch., S.J.: Anglia 42. f. 162: Fr. W. Murdoch to Fr. Duras, 8th July, 1602. (Fr. Forbes-Leith quotes from this same letter in a footnote (ib. 269) but wrongly ascribes the letter to Fr. Abercrombie.)

The question may be asked, why did not those "three old Jesuits" and their companions, however competent they may have been to form their own opinions—why did they not ask for their Superiors' advice before embarking on so momentous a policy? Such a question one might indeed parry with another: what hope can they have had that Rome would ever understand the complexities of the Scottish religious situation? Fr. Hay, the first local Superior, had certainly some cause to be sceptical. In the time of Mary, Queen of Scots, he had accompanied a Papal Nuncio (actually a Dutch Jesuit) to the Scottish court, and been forced to listen in silence to a particularly luscious example of foreign misconception. At a date when the ruins of the churches were still clean of moss, and when John Knox and his ministers were still loudly demanding the abolition even of the Queen's private chapel in Holyroodhouse, the good Nuncio, in conference with Queen Mary, was suggesting as "the easiest and most fitting method" of restoring Catholicism that she should establish near at hand a College of "pious and learned men"—priests, one presumes—who would instruct the people in general and youth in particular, in habits of Catholic piety.¹ Who would blame Fr. Hay if henceforth he preferred to follow his own counsels?

But a better answer to the question just proposed is provided by the fact that they *did* ask for advice. There survives one document at least, written out in Fr. Creichton's hand and containing a number of moral "cases" submitted for solution, with the official reply to each. In every case the difficulty is one of harmonising Catholic practice with the persecuting demands of the law: the replies as a whole most certainly do not lean to the side of leniency. As the first of these queries is not unconnected with the subject in hand, it may be of interest to quote it:

If Catholics are invited by the King himself and taken to the sermons of the heretics—sermons which are unaccompanied by heretical prayers and are not dangerous to listen to—can they with safe conscience be present at such, when without serious loss they cannot avoid these sermons, and their presence would cause no scandal?

Reply: Such sermons are to be avoided, since it is almost incredible that men, uncultured and little versed

¹ J. H. Pollen, S.J.: *Papal Negotiations with Q. Mary (S.H.S.)* pp. 119, 133.

in matters of religion, can be present at them without danger to their souls. But if it be certain, or extremely probable, that there is no scandal nor any danger to their souls, then, for the common good but not for any personal advantage, they can be present, provided no prayers be added.¹

The reply, it will be noticed, is as guarded as the question is carefully worded. Yet a wedge, and not just the very thin edge of it, is discernible clearly enough. Nevertheless it would seem that Aquaviva's later and more absolute prohibition was the wisest policy—in the event. During the last twenty years of the 16th century, and especially in the '80s, there was usually the prospect, or should we say the hope, of a political restoration of Catholicism. In fact there is at least some evidence to suggest that in Scotland the hope of restoration came at one time far nearer to realization than ever it did in England. What if success had actually been achieved, if only for a period? Surely this policy of moderated crypto-catholicism would have taken on a fairer and a warmer colouring in that light of dawn? But, as we know, the dawn did not come, and has not come. What might have been justified or condoned as a brief temporary expedient would be fraught with utter danger if converted into a permanent, life-long habit. Aquaviva, taking the longer, and, as it turned out, the more realistic view, insisted on a change of policy; and that we may believe was the wisest course—in the event.

Some divergence in practice between the missionaries in England and in Scotland still remained, even after the Scots Jesuits had conformed more closely to the English method of dealing with the crypto-catholics.

The English Fathers [S.J.], wrote Fr. Creighton,² all think (so I understand) that the Scottish Fathers allow Catholics to frequent the sermons of the heretics. But they are mistaken: the Scottish Fathers don't do this. But they do differ from the English Jesuits in that they don't hold those who occasionally go to the heretics' sermons to be schismatical or to need any other recon-

¹ Rom. Arch., S.J.: Angl. 42. f. 225: endorsed—"1587. Responsio data P. Creitoni de Casibus in Scotia accidentibus." It is not quite certain whence came the replies: likely enough, from some Roman theologian deputed ad hoc by the General S.J.

² *Ibid.*, Angl. 42, f. 169: Creighton to Aquaviva, Paris, 4th June, 1603.

ciliation to the Church than that of sacramental confession, as in the case of other sins. Whereas the English Fathers call them schismatics and say they need a special reconciliation before being admitted to hear Mass or join in Catholic services. . . . I don't object to this being done as a useful precaution (*industria*) ; but I do object to its being laid down as a Catholic and necessary doctrine.

Fr. Creighton was writing only a few months after Queen Elizabeth's death, when Scots were flocking in some numbers to the English Court in search of royal favour or other unconsidered trifles. Scottish crypto-catholics frequenting this Court may well have been astonished to discover that a change of latitude seemed to carry with it a change in orthodoxy. Possibly Dr. Wright may have been there to console them.

Alexander Seton, Earl of Dunfermline and Lord Chancellor of Scotland, was one such crypto-catholic. In his youth a pupil of the Jesuits at Rome, he always remained very friendly to them : but in matters of religion he tended to ca' canny.

He remains a Catholic, wrote Fr. Creighton in 1605,¹ though at times he attends the sermons of the heretics. . . . He often said to me [when I was] in Scotland, on my urging him to stand up for Catholicism : Don't press me to act before the time is ripe. I've got to *live* in Scotland, and I must bend to the times. But when occasion arises of doing something worth while, I will spare neither property nor blood nor life for the restoration of Catholicism.

How he fared religiously during his visits as Chancellor to England we are not told : a man of strong and independent character, he doubtless fended for himself. And we have it at least on the authority of his contemporary, Sir John Scot of Scotstarvet, that though he professed himself a Protestant in outward show, yet he "died an avowed papist."²

A far more interesting case is that of the reigning Queen, Anne of Denmark—a lady whose character has suffered considerably at the unsympathetic hands of contemporary propagandists. She certainly deserves more than can be said here at the tail-end of an article : her case however is an admirable illustration of our subject. That she *was* a

¹ *Ibid.*, Angl. 42, f. 195 : Creighton to Aquaviva, Billom, 20th July, 1605.

² The Staggering State of Scottish Statesmen. (MS. copy). There is a printed edition, published in 1742.

convert to Catholicism is or surely should be beyond all doubt.¹ The event must have occurred about the year 1599 ; and the priest who instructed and received her was that same Fr. Robert Abercrombie whose views on crypto-catholicism we have been discussing. Everything was done in secret and remained as secret as possible. The King was indeed clever enough to discover the change, but also broad-minded enough to tolerate it : or perhaps, even at that late date, he looked on her new faith as a possible political asset. " Well, wife, if you cannot get on without that sort of thing, keep it as secret as you can, I beg you : if you don't, our crown is in danger."

Her earliest years of Catholic life were thus spent secretly, with the sanction and under the guidance of Fr. Abercrombie, her confessor and director. Occasionally it was possible to arrange that she should hear Mass or receive the sacraments. And as for a ' Catholic environment,' she had presumably to be content with a few Catholic friends attached to her entourage, most if not all of whom would probably themselves be crypto-catholics of one shade or another, and would see no valid reason why they should not continue so. The sort of attitude they would adopt is easy to imagine : " what has been good enough for us for the last forty years or so is good enough still " : it is a well-known maxim of the diehards. Certainly they or such as they had strong words for this recent, new-fangled English usage, bringing ruin and beggary in its train, which the priests were now trying to enforce.

Then the Queen moved her home to England, and her difficulties, great already, increased sevenfold. She commenced bravely by refusing at all costs to receive the Anglican sacrament at her coronation. The King, one supposes, made his views on the subject icy-clear to her, when the ceremony was all over. At all events on an occasion some months later she is reported to have gone back on her resolutions : but she was " vexed with herself" and refused to do so again. At Denmark House a priest would often be smuggled

¹ But Bishop Mathew writes : " there is *some evidence* that she moved towards and *perhaps* accepted Catholicism " (Jacobean Age., p. 22, italics mine). Surely the caution is overdone : for what better evidence could anyone require than the first-hand evidence of Queen Anne herself and of the priest who received her ? Her own statement, in a letter to Card. Borghese, 31st July, 1601, is quoted by Fr. J. Brodrick, S.J. : B. Robert Bellarmine. II, p. 213. Fr. Abercrombie wrote at least two accounts of her conversion : in his " Narratio de Statu Regni Scotiae " (c. 1602) which is more or less accurately translated by Fr. Forbes-Leith (see p. 395 note ¹) ; and in his letter of September, 1608, (a copy) which is printed in Bellesheim. III, p. 451 sqq.

upstairs to an attic, that she might secretly hear Mass. And in later years, when the estate of Oatlands came into her possession, we are told that she maintained two priests, and was able to have daily Mass.

But this is not the place to attempt an *Apologia* of Queen Anne: nor would her character take kindly to whitewash. She was not a saint, nor yet a heroine. She revelled in power and royal pomp and the lavish expenditure of money. At no time was she prepared to assume the rôle of a Catharine of Aragon. But the very faults of her character, combined with the extreme delicacy of her position, demand a kindly judgment. How was she to act in matters of religion? She had her husband's crown to consider as well as her own. And for James I the crown of England was the most priceless possession in the world: he had sacrificed his own mother's life for its attainment. James I in fact was a very difficult and dangerous man to cross, as she had already discovered for herself. How was she to act? She needed above all an understanding, experienced director—a priest prepared to treat her with gentle consideration, and provide her with prudent, tactful advice. Did she find such a spiritual counsellor?

In the spring of 1605, a little before the birth of her daughter Mary, the Queen felt very ill and asked for a priest. An English Jesuit, Fr. Richard Blount, somehow managed secretly to gain access to Greenwich Palace. So on a similar errand had the Scots Jesuit, Fr. Abercrombie, sometimes come to her at Holyrood or Falkland or elsewhere. But here the resemblance ceases. Fr. Abercrombie had always treated her as a normal Catholic. Fr. Blount on the other hand explained to her as best he could that in England she was a schismatic; that sacramental absolution was out of the question unless she would first make solemn promise never again to attend the churches of the heretics. Oh yes, she promised¹ . . . the alternative was also out of the question.

¹ Stonyhurst MSS. A. IV, 12 (2), p. 245. Cf. Morris, S.J.: *Troubles*, I, 198. The document is dated 1st June, 1638. Fr. Morris then goes on to the oft-told story of her death-bed, and how she "died a good protestant." The two bishops of course were out for some evidence of that, and had obviously prepared their question beforehand. Fr. Morris blames the Queen for not replying with a neat scholastic distinction. Personally I have no difficulty in believing that she answered their question shortly with a "yes" or "I do": very un-theological, of course, but very understandable in the case of a woman in the last stages of dropsy and within a few hours of her death. But nobody would hang a dog on such evidence as that. So (I suspect) the answer was elaborated into what could be almost taken as the heading of a thesis: "I do," she answered;

But what a bewildered woman this visit of Fr. Blount must have left her ! No one, I take it, will cast a stone at Fr. Blount for acting as he did, or envy him the task of deciding as he felt bound to decide. The Queen, it seems clear, was either unwilling or unable to keep her pledge. And yet, had Fr. Abercrombie been able to come to her from Scotland at that time, or had it been Dr. Thomas Wright, for instance, who was summoned, it is unlikely that any such promise would have been demanded of her.

The bewilderment which must have affected Queen Anne and those many other crypto-catholics of whose lives and troubles we know even less, may possibly bewilder also the historian of these events—the historian especially who likes in his judgments to be tidy and complete ; for each packet of documents a clear moral judgment labelled on the outside, so as to obviate any later untying of the string. All power to the bewilderment of such !

H. CHADWICK.

and withal she said : " I renounce the mediation of saints . . . and only rely on my Saviour Christ. . . ." This suspicion, I trust, is not mere " wishful thinking " : at all events one may surely be entitled to ask for better evidence than that of an anonymous Scot to an anonymous correspondent concerning an interview at which he most probably was not present.

If you wish to have the Holy Spirit, mark this well, my brethren. Our spirit by which man is a living thing is called the soul . . . so you see what the soul does in the body. It gives life to all the members ; it sees through the eyes, it talks through the tongue, it works through the hands, it walks through the feet ; it is present at one and the same time to all the members so that they may live ; to each it gives life, to each it apportions its proper duty. The eye doth not hear, nor the tongue see, nor does the ear or eye talk ; but yet it lives, the ear lives, the tongue lives ; their duties are diverse, life they share in common. So is the Church of God. In some saints she works miracles ; in others she preaches the truth ; in yet others she protects virginity . . . in some she does one thing, in others another. All do what is severally fitting for them, but all share life in an equal degree. Now what the soul is to the body of man, that the Holy Spirit is in the body of Christ, which is the Church. The Holy Spirit does that in the whole Church, which the soul does in all the members of a single body. . . . If therefore you wish to live by the Holy Spirit, hold fast to charity, love truth, long for unity so that you may attain to true eternity.

St. Augustine. Sermon 267.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

JAPAN AND GERMANY

JAPAN is a land of contradictions. The Japanese combine great æsthetic sensibility and a ruthless efficiency in war with a crude and to Western minds childish religious belief. It is no stranger than the parallel situation which has arisen in Germany, where a bogus racialism and perverted hero-worship have been foisted on a people who have contributed the greatest music and some of the greatest literature and philosophy to the world.

We are familiar with the myth of the Nordic heroes and *Herren-volk* which the Nazis are trying to force on a tormented Europe. We are compelled to realise that the appeal to reason is weak compared with the appeal to emotion. Never has reason been at such a discount as it is to-day ; and with the collapse of reason, the rights of the individual have gone and standards of behaviour have crashed to unknown depths. The forces of unreason, terrible because they are blind, are destroying all that is not defended with equal ruthlessness. They are all the more formidable because backed by every material resource that modern science and technology can supply. This very efficiency and its success in an unprepared world helps to convince the Japanese and the Germans that they are born rulers and should be recognised as such. But in the case of Germany the conviction springs from a pseudo-religious belief, in the case of Japan from a genuine religious belief of a very primitive kind.

It is important to realise the implications of Emperor-worship which we are inclined to take for granted as merely a peculiarity of an outlandish race. When we read of primitive cults, we find them interesting as subjects for the anthropologist. The Japanese worship of an Emperor is more curious than any Malayan or Polynesian superstition, for it wears the trappings of western industrial civilisation. In a city equipped with electric trains, moving stairs and steel and concrete buildings, Japanese officials are expected to commit a ceremonious suicide if they trip up over a word when reading imperial pronouncements. An imposing modern structure has been built on the foundation of an archaic tribal cult.

Shinto consists of the worship of the land of Japan, the rulers of the Japanese race, the ancestors and heroes of the Japanese tribe, who were supposed to be descended from the Sun Goddess. Shinto is neither moral nor ethical ; the only positive virtue which it inculcates is loyalty to the tribe and the Emperor. Shinto belongs approximately to the stage in civilisation which the Saxons had reached before their conversion. Japan herself discarded it for over a thousand years. When the Japanese

acquired a veneer of Chinese civilisation and came under the influence of Buddhism, Shinto divinities were forgotten or converted into Buddhist saints, the Emperors abdicated and became Buddhist monks, detached from the wheel of existence. Always an imitative rather than a creative people, the Japanese borrowed a constitution and a code of morals from the Chinese. The Court officials ordered themselves into a Chinese hierarchy; a family system was developed, held together by Confucian filial piety. Educated Japanese studied Confucius, wrote Chinese verse, even adopted Chinese dress. There was nothing to oppose the influx of Chinese ideas but the native tradition of Shinto. All that remained of Shinto was the divinity of the imperial family which survived century after century, a strange anachronism, living in increasing seclusion and poverty. The Emperor retained his social prestige but by the end of the 18th century all political power had been usurped by the Shogun or Generalissimo whose family at that time was the Tokugawa. Foreign visitors nearly always took the Tokugawa Shogun for Emperor, as he had his own court and hierarchy of nobility at Yedo, while few people outside Japan knew that the real Emperor still lived at Kyoto, still divine but obscure and impoverished as the *hobereaux* before the French revolution. Besides the court nobility there was a whole hierarchy of military nobles, the Daimyo or feudal lords and the Samurai or feudal retainers. (The word Samurai actually means warrior).

Towards the end of the 18th century there was a revival of interest in Shinto and in the early chronicles of the Japanese race (*Kojiki* and *Nihongi*). Japanese scholars, reading of the ancient glories of the Emperor, could not help comparing the degraded position of the Emperor in their day with the position he had once held before Chinese civilisation had flooded Japan. The tribal stage of civilisation appeared to them as a golden age, as it has appeared to other mistaken patriots in other countries. The "good old days" is only the hackneyed expression of a deeply rooted fallacy that the more primitive the race, the worthier it must be; and the legend of the noble savage dies hard. Japanese scholars advocated a return to the ancient tribal ways and the restoration of the Emperor to his former pre-eminence. This revival of Shinto coincided with the growing curiosity of the Japanese people about the outside world. They had been kept in enforced seclusion from other countries since 1637, by their Tokugawa Shogun. The rapid success of Christianity in Japan in the 16th century had alarmed the Japanese rulers, who at once prohibited foreign learning. The Japanese however heard rumours of the scientific inventions of the west through the small Dutch trading settlement on the island of Deshima off Nagasaki. They were fascinated by western medicine; they learnt how to make clocks, and many ingenious versions of them appeared. The forcible opening of Japan to normal relations

with other countries was therefore welcomed by the Shinto revivalists. In 1868, fifteen years after Commodore Perry's appearance off Yedo with the "black ships," the Emperor was restored to his former eminence. He was taken from Kyoto and installed in the castle at Yedo, now renamed Tokyo or Eastern Capital. The opening of Japan thus led directly to the triumph of Shinto and the restoration of the Emperor to his primitive place. Far from deploring these events as retrogressive the youth of Japan exulted in the prospects which seemed to spread out before them. They were quick to learn from their first violent contact with western methods, and lost no time in emulating them. Factories started in which were reproduced the worst features of the industrial revolution; the army was equipped with modern weapons; a fleet was built. At the same time new shrines were erected in honour of the imperial family. When Meiji the first of the restored Emperors died, a shrine was built in Tokyo which is now the most popular place for marriages in the city. The mausoleum outside Kyoto—similar to the stone age barrows on Salisbury plain—became a place of national pilgrimage. The imperial myth was carefully instilled into each generation as it grew up. In school yards shrines were built to house the Emperor's portrait—one is reminded of the enlarged photographs of the Fuhrer and the Duce which glare down from the walls of every public building in Germany and Italy. The myths of the ancient chronicles were forced on the Japanese peoples as articles of belief, even more seriously than the Siegfried myth has been drummed into the heads of German children.

The people of Europe and America looked on at the transformation of Japan in surprise that quickly turned to admiration. A synthetic westernised state had sprung up in the Far East before their eyes, and they were impressed by the phenomenon. The English in particular admired the discipline and self-sacrifice of the Japanese in contrast to their own easy, rather shapeless manner of life. Japanese art became a *fin de siècle* fashion. When plucky little Japan stood up to the "giant liar," Tsarist Russia, the English were inclined to applaud. In the same way many English people were romantic about the Nazis in the early days of the movement. Travellers in Germany came back full of enthusiasm for the healthy open air life which the Nazi youth was encouraged to lead, and the benefits of discipline. Hitler had regenerated Germany, he had given the Germans something to live for, a great ideal—and none knew better than the Nazis how to exploit this admiration. Both mistakes arose from a lack of the critical and enquiring spirit which asks "What are the causes behind these national phenomena?" "What is the basis of this romantic ideology?" It is found, as we have seen, in the mists of pre-history, in a throwback to tribalism and totemism. Japanese nationalism has no moral, philosophical nor scientific basis. The antique virtues admired by the west,

loyalty, self-discipline, self-sacrifice, can be used for evil as well as good ends with fatal ease. Japanese standards of right and wrong bore no relation to any universal standard of truth or perfection. The Japanese never attempted to measure their own pitifully inadequate faith against the great philosophies of east and west, for the latter meant nothing to them. Their ideas were narrowed within the bounds of a temporal authority and a person of flesh and blood. Looking at the world between blinkers, they perceived nothing of world civilisation except its material excrescences. Only people who had stultified their own reasoning powers and killed their own critical faculty could so arrogantly claim a mission to rule the world or, as they would express it, to enable all men to enjoy the benefits of the Emperor's rule. *Hakko Ichiu* meaning all the world under one (Japanese) roof, is a popular slogan in Japan. It is difficult for us to realise that the titular head of an aggressive and unpopular nation is to his own people a living God. The idea would be ludicrous were it not taken seriously, as the *Herrenvolk* idea is taken seriously, by a resolute, efficient and fanatically brave people. Before the war we took our civilisation for granted, we accepted complacently our heritage of political and intellectual liberty and believed that the virtues of democracy would bring their own reward. We have learnt from bitter experience that the totalitarian countries can outmatch us in material inventiveness, in speed and drive, in confidence and conviction. We must realise, while developing our technical efficiency to equal theirs, where our true strength lies; in our inheritance of wisdom, our belief in universal justice, our knowledge that all the acts of man are only approximations to an absolute perfection. On this is built true civilisation, European and Asiatic, which Germany and Japan are doing their best to destroy.

A CORRESPONDENT LATELY IN JAPAN.

"THE MONTH" FORWARDING SCHEME

It is with special gratitude that we wish to thank all those who have assisted the Forwarding Scheme during the past year. It has meant, we know very well, a real sacrifice. But never was a gift more appreciated—to judge from the letters we receive. We are asked continually for more and more copies; we should be most grateful for further subscriptions to enable us to send them.

To certain countries publications can be sent only directly from the publishers. The Manager of THE MONTH has permission to send them. Whence the added value now of a direct subscription in favour of a missionary.

Readers who are willing to forward their "Month" to a missionary or to provide an annual subscription (14s.) for one to be sent direct to the more distant outposts, are asked to communicate with The Hon. Secretary, "The Month" Forwarding Scheme, 114 Mount Street, Grosvenor Square, London, W.1. Readers must enclose a stamped addressed envelope, and all names and addresses, whether of missionaries applying for "The Month," or readers providing it, should be printed in capitals.

OUR CONTEMPORARIES

AMERICA : June 27th, 1942. **"Experts" on Latin America Gather Data on the Wing**, by Hernane Tavares De Sa. [A friendly protest by a Brazilian university professor against books on South America, that are issued in the United States and that ignore completely the influence of Catholicism.]

CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW : July, 1942. **The Jacobean Oath of Allegiance and English Lay Catholics**, by Clarence J. Ryan, S.J. [An interesting study of historical evidence which shows that this Oath was cunningly intended to divide Catholic opinion, and that the Oath legislation was enforced with great vigour.]

CLERGY REVIEW : August, 1942. **Patriotism**, by Rev. Lawrence L. McReavy. [Contains a timely diagnosis of the virtue of patriotism, with its threefold obligation of respect, of preferential love, and of obedience to legitimate authority.]

COMMON CAUSE : July 19th, 1942. **Grunwald**, by General Józef Haller. [The story of the aggressiveness of the Teutonic Knights and of their defeat at Grunwald in 1410.]

CONDITIONS IN OCCUPIED TERRITORIES : No. 3. **Religious Persecution**. [A valuable summary of evidence showing the deliberately anti-Christian and anti-Catholic policy pursued by Germany in the various occupied countries : everywhere obvious, it is at its most violent in Poland and Jugoslavia.]

HOMILETIC AND PASTORAL REVIEW : July, 1942. **Courageous Preaching**, by Right Rev. Mgr. H. T. Henry. [Has some admirable remarks on the need of courageous and outspoken preaching which must be tempered none the less with calmness and discretion.]

IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD : August and October, 1942. **The Morality of State-Punishment**, by Rev. Michael J. Mooney, D.D. [A timely examination of the three rival theories of State-punishment—the deterrent or utilitarian view, the reformatory or medicinal, and the retributive.]

TABLET : August 15th and 22nd, 1942. **The Catholic Church in China**, by James Brodrick, S.J. [Father Brodrick gives us a delightful account of Catholic missionary work in China—from its first spring through what promised to be a fair summer to the second spring we are witnessing to-day.]

UNIVERSE : August 21st, 1942. **Former Universe Editor Writes His Own Obituary**. [Mr. Herbert S. Dean, K.C.S.G., was the well-known and well-respected editor of the Universe from 1917 to 1938 and here, in three modest and revealing columns, he bequeathes his auto-obituary.]

YOUNG CHRISTIAN WORKER : Summer, 1942. **Win The Peace**. [We are reminded that the Young Christian Worker movement is very much alive—through glimpses of its past history, letters from its members serving overseas, and its call to action for the immediate future.]

REVIEWS

1. PONTIFICAL CEREMONIES¹

THERE was a time—and that not very far distant—when those who were responsible for the preparation of even ordinary ceremonies could complain with justice of the dearth of suitable books on the subject in English. Until 1918, practically the only book available was Dale's translation of Baldeschi's *Ceremoniario della S. Basilica Vaticana*, from its origin obviously more Roman than English and certainly not ideal for use in this country.

At the suggestion of the publishers, the late Adrian Fortescue set out to prepare a new edition revised and brought up to date, but he soon found that it would be simpler to write an entirely new book. His "Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described" marked the opening of the era of new liturgical books in England. This book has since been re-edited and revised by Father O'Connell who has himself just published a brilliant work in three volumes: "The Celebration of Mass: A Study of the Rubrics of the Roman Missal." Father Fortescue and Father O'Connell have set a very high standard, and of necessity, it is by comparison with their books that one judges similar publications on the liturgy.

The latest addition to the ranks is: "Pontifical Ceremonies—a study of the Episcopal Ceremonies" by two Professors of St. John's College, Waterford, the Reverends Pierce Ahearne, D.D., B.C.L., and Michael Lane, B.A. Their object as stated in the Preface "is an attempt to give one definite method for the carrying out of the principal episcopal ceremonies of the Roman Rite which occur in the course of the ecclesiastical year." One is tempted to ask why in view of that object the book was not entitled "Some Pontifical Ceremonies." However, apart from the ceremonies of Ordination and the Consecration of Churches and Altars, the book does deal comprehensively with the common functions of the year: Pontifical Mass at the Throne; Pontifical Requiem Mass at the Throne; Solemn Mass in presence of the Ordinary; Solemn Requiem in presence of the Ordinary; Pontifical Mass at the Faldstool; the Bishop at Low Mass; The Ceremonies of the Purification and Ash Wednesday and during Holy Week; Episcopal Visitation and Confirmation and Pontifical Blessings, although Pontifical Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament is relegated to an Appendix.

It will be found eminently useful and serviceable by those who

¹ *Pontifical Ceremonies: A Study of the Episcopal Ceremonies*, by the Reverend Pierce Ahearne, D.D., B.C.L. and the Reverend Michael Lane, S.T.L., B.A. London and Dublin: Burns Oates & Washbourne. Pp. xv, 358. Price, 15s. n. 1942.

need a full and detailed description of the ceremonies and it is a useful companion to Fortescue—O'Connell where the Episcopal Ceremonies are treated less fully. May we be pardoned however for the general feeling that it does not inspire the same confidence as Father O'Connell's books. Nor is it as well documented; indeed the authors prepare us for this in the Preface—and really it is quite understandable since there is far less literature on the subject of Pontifical Ceremonies.

The authors' plan is admirable. After giving a brief synopsis of the whole ceremony, they describe in detail the duty of each person who takes part in the function, with special reference to the Inferior Ministers, going sometimes into unnecessary parts, e.g., the Acolytes of Ring and Pectoral Cross, Acolytes of the Torches and Acolyte of the *spinulae*—parts which would normally be duplicated by other servers. Particularly useful, alike to Masters of Ceremonies and Sacristans, is the exhaustive list of things to be got ready before each ceremony according to the place where they have to be prepared.

It seems a pity, however, that the authors have not employed terms commonly used in England in describing such ceremonies. For example, among unfamiliar expressions may be noted: Ceremonialist, Senior M.C., Junior M.C., Senior and Junior Deacon at the Throne (although these are called 1st and 2nd Assistant in the Instructions for the Mitre-bearer), Cloth of Gold Mitre, Chanters, Extern Bishop, Benedictionale (our Ritus), Acolytes of the *spinulae*; and the Bishop wears a *zimarra*. Similarly, the translation given of the Indulgence is not the one commonly used by English Bishops.

Incidentally, there are a few indications that the book is intended primarily for Irish readers, e.g. on page 323, footnote 27 reads: "If the monstrance has not been placed on the throne, the more correct practice for Benediction, as distinct from protracted Exposition (I.E.R., Vol. L. p. 646), the priest who exposed the Blessed Sacrament need not ascend to the predella." Our English *Ritus Servandus* lays it down quite definitely: *Ostensorium in throno collocat*. The diagrams used to illustrate the more complicated positions seem to us to leave much to be desired and to verge at times upon the ludicrous, e.g. pages 85 and 208. It would be an obvious advantage if the same numbers had been used for the same Ministers in every case. The book is well produced and printed, and has been proof-read carefully, but there are many places where the meaning could have been made much clearer by careful attention to the use of the comma. There is a full index but no glossary.

While the book can be recommended to those who have to take part in any of the Episcopal functions described, may we hope that its publication will not prevent Father O'Connell from treating of them if such were ever his intention!

R.G.

TH
tic
extert
Christ
1 The
Zeiller.
2 Death
Green.

2. A NEW CHURCH HISTORY¹

SIX years ago, M. Augustin Fliche, Dean of the Faculty of Letters at Montpellier, and Mgr. Victor Martin, Dean of the Faculty of Catholic Theology in Strasbourg, launched a new Church History upon the world. Among their chief collaborators were to be Père Lebreton, S.J., Pierre de Labriolle, Albert de Meyer, G. Constant, Waldemar Gurian, Gustave Bardy, Louis Bréhier and E. Amann. Before the war, this gallant venture had reached the fourth volume out of its projected twenty-four. What has happened since, we do not know.

Messrs. Burns and Oates are to be congratulated on committing themselves to an English version of this important work. The first volume now appears, in a very competent translation by Dr. E. C. Messenger, with the title, "The Church in the New Testament." Most of it is from the pen of Père Lebreton, and this is a sufficient guarantee of its value. "It is pretty safe to say" wrote our MONTH reviewer in May, 1936, "that those two volumes (the first two to appear) contain the ablest, clearest and most completely scholarly account of the Church from the beginning to the accession of Constantine that has ever been written by Catholics in any language." The original review continues in the following glowing terms. "Père Lebreton's sections on the Church in the New Testament, the Christian Apologists, Gnosticism, Origen, etc., are such models of lucidity, balance and alert scholarship as we might have expected from the *Petavius Redivivus*, as Henri Bremond shrewdly styles him, who gave us that great classic of Catholic learning, "*Les Origines du dogme de la Sainte Trinité*." On the more definitely historical side, dealing, for instance, with such topics as the propagation of Christianity, the organization of the early Church, the persecutions, etc., M. Zeiller, well known for his archaeological investigations, is equally effective."

And so we have been—to some extent—reviewing in advance, dealing with Volume I, that has now appeared, and Volume II, which we trust is very shortly to follow. May the distinguished French scholars carry on their original design from the fourth to the twenty-fourth volume! And may we have them in as competent an English version as this first volume!

3. DEATH AND LIFE²

THIS latest work of Father D'Arcy is an important contribution to Christian apologetics, and will, we are convinced, exert a wide influence. Many of those who write in defence of Christianity have but scant knowledge of contemporary currents

¹ *The History of the Primitive Church*, by Jules Lebreton, S.J., and Jacques Zeiller. London: Burns, Oates. Pp. 269. Price: 16s. n. 1942.

² *Death and Life*, by the Reverend M. C. D'Arcy, S.J. London: Longmans, Green. Pp. xii, 180. Price, 5s. n. 1942.

of thought, and in consequence hardly appreciate the obstacles to belief felt by the present generation. Their arguments are sound and conclusive, but they fail to touch a responsive chord in the minds of those to whom they are addressed. Father D'Arcy is not of this number. He is fully familiar with modern philosophy, and knows precisely what difficulties call for solution, what misapprehensions must be removed. His arguments will go home. Furthermore, he writes with a lightness of touch and a copiousness of illustration which make it easy to follow his thought even on highly abstract subjects.

The book has two parts: the first mainly philosophical, the second theological. The first part is concerned with the essential difference between matter and mind, the relation between the body and the soul in man, the immortality of the soul. Here Father D'Arcy deals at some length with the opinion, now somewhat in the fashion and maintained among others by Dr. Julian Huxley and Sir C. Sherrington, that mind and matter are merely two aspects of "energy." He subjects the theory to a severe criticism, and has little difficulty in exposing its inconsistencies and internal contradictions. He says with perfect justice:

(The theory) is full of unthought-out fancies. We are to imagine power and energy which of itself makes patterns and designs, and finally reaches the degree of organic life which becomes self-conscious, discriminating, and theoretical. Now energy of itself can do none of these things, and in order to make the theory even faintly plausible, the inventor has to slip in words which fit some agent behind the scenes, some conscious activity which has an aim and knows what it is doing. . . . Wherever a difficulty occurs, it is crossed with a jump and ignored (p. 17).

We do not think that any upholder of this system who reads this chapter, will continue to feel at ease about the tenability of his views.

The second part of the work is a defence of the Christian teaching on the after-life—of the supernatural order, of hell, purgatory and heaven. In this the author faces a task of special difficulty: for no part of the Christian revelation is a greater stumbling-block to the modern mind than the doctrine of eternal punishment and indeed of retributive justice in general. His exposition of the truths in question is admirable, and he establishes convincingly that they do not in any way conflict with the Divine attributes of love and mercy. He emphasizes the point, too often forgotten, that it is impossible to eliminate the idea of retribution from punishment, inasmuch as this is the necessary basis of its other aspects: that it would be positively unjust to inflict suffering for educative purposes or as a deterrent, unless the person really merited to suffer for his wrongdoing. The last chapter deals with the doctrine of the beatific vision. To explain, without the technical terminology of the schools, the elevation of the human

intellect to the immediate vision of the Godhead, so far as that doctrine admits of explanation, is no easy task. Yet this is successfully achieved. The book, as we have said, is of the highest value, and cannot fail to be productive of much good.

G. H. J.

4. CATHOLIC ART AND CULTURE¹

MR. WATKIN has written an interesting essay on the development of Catholic culture. He traces a double movement. The first portion is cyclic, from the autumn of the pagan religion-culture through the spring, summer, autumn and winter of the Catholic religion-culture, with the hint of a new spring that is soon to blossom. The second is quasi-Hegelian, the movement from the thesis, transcendence, through the antithesis, immanence, to a fully synthesis, *transcendence in and beyond immanence*. Put in simpler terms, there has been in Christian development that tension between the vertical, reaching outwards towards God, and the horizontal embracing of *omne humanum*, namely, art, literature, philosophy. On the whole, he considers that Christian evolution has erred in over-stressing the vertical at the expense of the horizontal.

There is a pleasant chapter on the late autumn of classical culture. Possibly its happiest note is a comparison between the "Baroque" character of very late Roman poetry, that of Ausonius and Sidonius, and the full Baroque of the post-Reformation era. The break-up of the old Imperial order affected the character of Christian art, devotion, and organisation. "The challenge of anarchy was met by the affirmation of an order established by the Divine Ruler, perfect above, to be wrought out below, the order of Church government, the ecclesiastical hierarchy reflecting, as Dionysius saw it, the hierarchy of heaven, of Roman law, codified at this epoch by Justinian, of religious obedience, of the Liturgy, now fixed in detail, of an art hieratic, formal, courtly and majestic and of the disciplined Gregorian music."

Mr. Watkin's seasons are naturally somewhat arbitrary. But there did occur in the eighth century "the first flowering of a Latin religion-culture, under the protection of a Latin Empire embracing the greater part of Western Europe." This later developed into the May of the twelfth century and the June of the thirteenth century. Catholic culture reached its summit in the *Summa* of St. Thomas, the *Divina Commedia* of Dante, and the mediæval cathedral. But Mr. Watkin is no mediævalist. For, in his judgment, the Renaissance was to conclude with an artist who more perfectly than any other, *more perfectly even than the Gothic cathedral*, "embodied the synthesis of Christianity and humanism, of nature and the supernatural, the vertical and the horizontal movements."

¹ *Catholic Art and Culture*, by E. I. Watkin. London: Burns, Oates. Pp. vii, 176. Price: 9s. n. 1942.

This is Michael Angelo. He finds in Michael Angelo's Creation in the Sistine chapel the perfect blend of "Hebraism and Hellenism," the ideal achievement of Catholic art and culture.

This leads us naturally to Mr. Watkin's chapter on the autumn of the Catholic religion-culture, namely, Baroque. This is by far the best portion of an interesting book. Following authorities like Fokker and Weisbach, he discovers the true nature of Baroque in the employment of the rich and newly-recovered classical forms by the Gothic spirit. This gives a continuity which is missed in other explanations. "There was a Baroque style of living, a Baroque temper of mind, and social and political institutions in harmony with them. All these were Gothic and classical, a classical embodiment and expression of the Gothic soul." Baroque had become more self-conscious than Gothic, but its spirit was the same. It stressed the finite, the limited, with its many ornaments and its sense of formal decoration; but, at the same time, it reached upwards towards the Infinite. Forms seemed to lose their outlines in an upward sweep, in which all the arts combined to raise eye and mind aloft towards God. The note of the ecstatic in Baroque sculpture and painting is not lost sight of by Mr. Watkin.

Mr. Watkin's review of the past is illuminating and very sound. One might quarrel with some of his statements but that is by the way. His prophecies for the future are far more questionable. He mentions Joachim of Flora and dreams of a new world "wrought by the Holy Ghost." Prophecy is always risky and the author is on safer ground when he gives details of the new Catholic art and architecture which have appeared on the Continent since the last war. A new Catholic art has manifested itself. "It is tentative and uncertain. And the idiom it employs is too often the bare and stark idiom of a mass civilization."

Every theme can be over-worked. This is our feeling about the cyclic theme of Mr. Watkin. The summer-autumn-winter *diminuendo* seems to us somewhat forced. Catholic culture should be a reflection of the vitality of the Church. And who would suggest that the Church was less vital and alive to-day than in the Gothic or Baroque ages?

D L. K.

SHORT NOTICES

BIOGRAPHICAL

Archbishop McNicholas has said of the founder of Maryknoll, America's first seminary for foreign missionaries: "I do not hesitate to say that Bishop Walsh is the greatest missionary that America has ever given to the Church." This might seem extravagant praise till we remember that the foreign-missionary tradition in the United States is of very recent growth. The U.S.A. felt itself a mission country rather than a source of missionary priests for other lands. The story of Father James Anthony

(later Bishop) Walsh is now given us under the title **All the Day Long** (Longmans, New York, 10s. 6d. n.)—a phrase from a Newman prayer of which Fr. Walsh was very fond. The author is Daniel Sargent, already known as a successful biographer of St. Thomas More. In a crisp and graphic style, which is occasionally a trifle too jerky and *staccato*, he paints the vivid portrait of a talented, zealous and saintly man. The future Bishop Walsh was born in 1867 in Cambridge, Massachusetts, under the shadow of Harvard University, where he spent some portion of his academic career. Before it, he had studied with the Jesuits at Boston College; after it, he entered the Boston diocesan seminary at Brighton. This seminary was conducted by the Sulpicians, the Rector being a remarkable man of Irish birth and French education, the Abbé Hogan, who interested his students in foreign missions, particularly those conducted by the French. From these seminary days dates Fr. Walsh's deep veneration for France and for the heroism of France's missionaries. Ordained in 1892, he was to serve ten years as assistant priest in a city parish: and then, in 1902, he was nominated Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith (in the Boston archdiocese). Material success justified this appointment. In 1904 Boston collected one fourth of the entire S.P.F. total for the United States, and more than any other single diocese in Christendom. 1907 saw the first number of a missionary periodical, *The Field Afar*, from which much of the material of this biography has been taken. In 1910, at the Eucharistic Congress in Montreal, he met Father Price from North Carolina; and what was often known as the firm of "Walsh and Price" was established. Their one great desire was the foundation of a special seminary in the United States for priests who would work abroad. The Catholic Foreign Mission Society of America made its modest debut in 1911 at Hawthorne, in Westchester County, and had migrated to Maryknoll, by the end of the following year. Guide, builder, organizer—Father Walsh was all this: and the new venture involved journeys to Europe and especially to Rome, and one long round trip, in 1917, across Japan, Corea and Eastern China. On that occasion the Bishop of Hong Kong offered the new society a district under his jurisdiction: and in April, 1918, the first four "Maryknollers" left the States for China. The mission has prospered: the Catholics of the U.S.A. have become increasingly mission-minded. Father Walsh was consecrated bishop, with the titular see of Siene, in 1933. Before his death, three years afterwards, he had the happiness of consecrating another bishop for Maryknoll's Chinese mission and of learning that yet another American "Maryknoller" had been consecrated bishop out in China. Mr. Sargent's book is an admirable piece of biography. It throws a strong light both on the development of the Church within the Eastern United States and on the awakening of a missionary consciousness among American Catholics.

HISTORICAL

In his **Reflections on the Isle of Barra** (Sands, 7s. 6d. n.), Dr. Donald Buchanan shows us how the islanders have clung to their simple life of fishing and farming. The Christian religion came to them, probably from the Irish monks on Iona. Stern toil and a rigorous climate moulded their brave and poetic character and set a seal upon their sturdy faith. The island organization approximated to that of the clan, and the McNeils attained to something like the dignity of chieftains. So they lived, in religious and civic peace, till the Reformation descended upon them, depriving them of priests and sacraments during centuries. The faith, once flourishing, dwindled and very nearly died. Later, the islanders heard tell of a young Irish priest preaching like a true apostle on the adjacent mainland and they invited him, as the Macedonians invited St. Paul, to come over and preach to them. It is edifying to read of the McNeil, with his wife and family, sitting along with the peasants at the feet of Fr. Denis Duggan, this new apostle. Fr. Duggan remained with them for many years, re-converted all the southern portion of Barra, and had turned his steps northwards before he died. It is a touching and enlightening story.

The rest of the book is concerned with the island's industries and crafts, food-production, fishing and bird-catching, with housing, clothing and education. Interesting chapters tell of the island's literature and of politics and recreation. The author was born and bred among these islanders. He has attained high honours in his profession and has travelled far and wide but he can still look back with pride and affection upon the folk of his sea-girt island.

POLITICAL

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler is President of Columbia University in the U.S.A. and President also of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He is a firm friend of Britain, a sturdy liberal, and a foe to all tyranny and intolerance. His latest book, **Liberty—Equality—Fraternity**, published by Charles Scribner's Sons in New York, contains yet another collection of his essays and addresses. They vary in length and importance. Some are slight speeches, e.g., at annual meetings of the Pilgrims of the U.S.A. Others are longer and treat, for the most part, of the problems of the war and of reconstruction. A few are American rather than universal in their general appeal: but the majority are well worth our attention and include sound comment upon our present difficulties with equally sound suggestions for the framing of a post-war world. The dedication is a heartening one, viz., "to those who in any land can and do look forward with faith and with courage." Of this goodly number Dr. Murray Butler is certainly one. He insists that the democracies must first win "the brutal and murderous war into which, wholly

against their will, they have been driven." They must then be prepared to act "with promptness, foresight and complete understanding to do all in their power to make any repetition of this colossal world disturbance impossible under any conditions." Public opinion must be so educated that it will guide Governments to shape a new world organization along federal lines which will, in effect, "do for the whole world what the Constitution of the United States and the organization of the British Commonwealth of Nations have been able to do successfully for the English-speaking peoples."

Dr. Murray Butler is a firm individualist who defends Capital and liberal institutions; who argues that the chief task of democracy is to produce its own aristocracy (it must discover those most competent to render it important and responsible service); who claims that the traditional policy of the United States is not that of isolationism and that America's great betrayal of her position and responsibilities in 1919-20 was in defiance of the true American tradition. "It was the petty politicians at Washington and their shocking disregard of moral and political obligation which threw away the great opportunity which our government had envisaged and of which both political parties had pledged themselves to take advantage."

He is opposed to Socialism as leading to regimentation and to tyranny: condemns the local intolerance of the Ku Klux Klan as he does the oppression of Nazi Germany: and emphasizes the need of religious influence in education. "The fundamental thing to remember is that education is the joint product of the influence of the family, the church and the school. The school has but a very limited and a very definite function to perform." Altogether, this is an encouraging and helpful book.

MORAL

With the development of Sword of the Spirit and kindred activity there has been a continual demand for some clear and definite statement of the Christian ethical and social position. Father Henry Keane's **A Primer of Moral Philosophy** that was published in 1926 and re-appeared in 1931, seemed just what was required. The Catholic Social Guild has recently re-published the first half of Father Keane's handbook—at the very modest war-time price of 1s. 6d. n. This first portion deals with general norms and standards: with the character of human acts, with moral criteria and moral virtue, and also with the important problems of "Moral Obligation and Natural Law." The book is lucid and straightforward, and there are questions for revision at the conclusion of every chapter. This re-issue of a valuable handbook should be duly appreciated. One hopes that the second portion of the work will shortly be available. It will require considerable re-shaping as it treats of the various and swiftly-changing systems of modern social reformers.

CHILDREN'S BOOKS

Miss Cecily Hallack's services to English Catholic letters are well-known. Here we have in **All About Selina** (Sands, 5s. n.) a slight posthumous work, intended for the edification of younger children. Selina was a problem child who had out-fatigued nine governesses. Then fortune played its occasional winning trick. There came a tenth governess who was too much for Selina and quite transformed her. As she appears in "Robin's" neat illustrations, Miss Brown—alias governess No. 10—is highly competent and able to cope with a score of Selinas. The book is a useful addition to Catholic juvenile literature.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

BURNS, OATES AND WASHBOURNE,
London.

My Church Book. Arranged by F. H. Drinkwater. Pp. 80. Price : 3s. 6d. n. *The History of the Primitive Church.* By Jules Lebreton, S.J., and Jacques Zeiller. Translated by Dr. E. C. Messenger. Vol. I. Pp. 269. Price : 16s. n. *Friedrich Nietzsche, Philosopher of Culture.* By Frederick Copleston, S.J. Pp. xii, 217. Price : 8s. 6d. n. *The Early Story of St. Cuthbert's Grammar School, Newcastle-on-Tyne.* By Rev. C. Hart, B.A. Pp. 140. Price : 3s. 6d. n.

CATHOLIC SOCIAL GUILD, Oxford.

A Primer of Moral Philosophy : Parts I and II. By Henry Keane, S.J. Third Edition. Pp. 116. Price : 1s. 6d. n. *Planning and the Community.* By Michael P. Fogarty. Pp. 64. Price 1s. n.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
PRESS, Washington, D.C.

Principles of Education according to Bishop Dupanloup. By Sister Mary Albert Lenaway, O.P., M.A. Pp. xi, 169.

EDUCATIONAL COMPANY OF IRELAND
LIMITED, Dublin and Cork.

A History of the Catholic Church for Schools : Vol. I (A.D. 30-800). By Rev. J. Mahony, S.J. Pp. viii, 207. Price : 2s. 9d. n.

FABER AND FABER, London.

Midnight Hour. By Nicodemus. Pp. 177. Price : 8s. 6d. n.

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY PRESS,
New York.

The Oration of Demosthenes on the Crown. By F. P. Simpson and F. P. Donnelly, S.J. Pp. 356. Price : \$2.25. *The Testament of Mary.* By Charles Donahue. Pp. viii, 70. Price : \$1.50.

M. H. GILL AND SON, Dublin.

The Fourteen Stations of the Cross. By Rev. Denis O'Shea, C.C. Pp. viii, 86. Price : 1s. n.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.,
London and New York.

All The Day Long. By Daniel Sargent. Pp. x, 259. Price : 10s. 6d. n. *Before The War : Studies in Diplomacy.* By G. P. Gooch, D.Litt., F.B.A., Vol. I. Pp. viii, 438 : Vol. II. Pp. viii, 447. Price : 10s. n. (each). *Studies in Diplomacy and Statecraft.* By G. P. Gooch, D.Litt., F.B.A. Pp. viii, 373. Price : 12s. 6d. n.

MANRESA PRESS,

Roehampton, London.

What is Purity? By Thomas Corbishley, S.J. Pp. 52. Price : 4d. n.

METHUEN AND CO., London.

Conscience and Society. By Ranyard West. Pp. 260. Price : 15s. n.

The Church and the Modern World. By R. A. Edwards. Pp. 92. Price : 3s. 6d. n.

SANDS, London.

Reflections on the Isle of Barra. By Donald Buchanan, Ch.B., M.D. Pp. 239. Price : 7s. 6d. n. *All About Selina.* By Cecily Hallack. Pp. 146. Price : 5s. n.

ERRATUM

In the July-August number it was stated that the publishers of *A Detection of Aumbries* by Dom Gregory Dix, of Nashdom Abbey, were Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. The actual publishers are the Dacre Press, Westminster, to whom we tender our apologies for this mistake.

Printed in Great Britain at the BURLEIGH (CATHOLIC) PRESS, BRIS